

**Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
and
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council**

Local Development Framework

**Consultation Statement
for the
Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning
Document(s)**

**Adopted on 17th September 2007
by
Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council**

| Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Why Prepare a Statement of Consultation? | 3 |
| 2. About the Statement of Consultation | 3 |
| 3. The Regulations | 3 |
| 4. Participation and Consultation at pre-Draft Stage | 4 |
| 5. Stage One: Scoping and Options | 5 |
| 6. Stage Two: Testing the Content | 7 |
| 7. Sustainability Appraisal | 8 |
| 8. Equalities Impact Assessment | 9 |
| 9. Habitat Regulations Assessment | 9 |
| 10. Approval of draft by Elected Council Members | 9 |
| 11. Stage Three: Draft Consultation | 9 |
| | |
| Appendix 1 – Consultation on the Scoping Report – Comments received and Councils responses | 12 |
| Appendix 2 – Organisations/stakeholders consulted at each Pre-Draft stage | 15 |
| Appendix 3 – Consultation at Pre-Draft Stages – Comments received and Consultants/Client Team responses. | 16 |
| Appendix 4 Specific Consultation Bodies and Government Departments who were Consulted on SPD(s) | 46 |
| Appendix 5 – General and Other Consultees | 47 |
| Appendix 6 – Design Guidance Representation Form | 49 |
| Appendix 7 – Schedule of Comments Received to Draft SPD(s) and Council's Responses | 56 |

1. Why Prepare a Statement of Consultation?

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is a requirement to prepare and publish a consultation statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs). This statement sets out information on the consultation process that has been carried out on the preparation of the SPD(s) and how the Councils have taken into account any comments received.

2. About the Statement of Consultation

- 2.1 The guidance on urban design has been prepared, in partnership with Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (MBC), Oldham MBC and the Oldham and Rochdale Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, by Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design Ltd,
- 2.2 This statement of consultation explains how the four partners have sought to involve all relevant organisations and interested parties in the preparation of the Urban Design Guide (SPD(s)).
- 2.3 The guidance is made up of a series of documents:
- The Urban Design Guide;
 - The Residential Design Guide; and
 - The Public Realm Design Guide.
- 2.4 The guidance has been prepared through joint-working by the four partners identified above however Oldham MBC has adopted the series of documents as one Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as outlined in its Local Development Scheme (LDS). Rochdale MBC has adopted the documents as a series of separate SPDs as identified in its LDS.
- 2.5 Following extensive consultation on local design issues and the options for tackling them (i.e., the focus and content of the guidance) the Urban Design Guide SPD(s) have now been finalised and are ready for publication.
- 2.6 Whilst not formally part of the SPD(s) the Council's have also taken the opportunity to consult on the Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice. This document aims to promote best practice and clearly set out the local authorities' expectations.

3. The Regulations

- 3.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (the Regulations) require that planning authorities should prepare SPDs in accordance with their Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) or with the minimum requirements in the Regulations where there is no adopted SCI.
- 3.2 The SPD has been prepared and consulted upon in accordance with Oldham MBC's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

- 3.3 Rochdale MBC's Statement of Community Involvement is at Submitted Draft stage. The Regulations require the Council to consult each of the specified bodies to the extent that the Council thinks the SPD affects that body and any other bodies that the Council considers appropriate and sets out what publicity should be given. The Regulations also require that a statement must be published at the time of formal consultation on the SPD, which should detail how Councils have sought to involve the community and stakeholders in its preparation.
- 3.4 This consultation statement demonstrates that both Councils have more than met the requirements set out in:
- Regulation 17 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004; and
 - The guidance set out in Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks.

4. Participation and Consultation at pre-Draft stage

- 4.1. The Brief for the Oldham Rochdale Urban Design Guidance sought not only to create comprehensive urban design guidance for the two boroughs, but also to ensure that the process of producing the guidance helped to raise the profile of design through consultation with all those involved in development. In other words, the process of developing the Urban Design Guidance was seen as important as the guidance itself.
- 4.2 Tibbalds Planning and Design Ltd was selected to lead the team producing the Guidance. In partnership with the two Boroughs and the HMR, Tibbalds devised an approach to consultation that consisted of the following stages:

Stage One: Scoping and Options

This stage of the consultation aimed to gain an understanding of:

- what local stakeholders felt made a good place, so leading to a discussion about the broad urban design principles that are common to good places;
- the lessons learned from good and bad practice in the local area;
- the obstacles to achieving good quality design at present; and
- the key issues that the Design Guidance needed to address.

Stages Two and Three: Testing the Design Guidance

This stage of consultation was aimed at:

- helping all stakeholders understand the role of the Design Guidance so that they can make informed comments on the drafts; and
- enabling stakeholders to review draft copies of the Design Guidance and provide feedback to the client and consultant team.

Sections 5 and 6 below provide a summary of these two consultation stages.

5. Stage One: Scoping and Options

5.1 Stage One consisted of two workshop sessions and a series of one-to-one follow-up interviews with key stakeholders. The two workshop events were:

- for planning, highways and environmental health officers of Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC, and was held on 7 April 2005 at Rochdale Town Hall;
- the second consisted of two identical workshops in one day for wider stakeholders (including housing associations, developers, and local architects) on 9 May 2005 at Touchstones Gallery in Rochdale.

5.2 The officer workshop was useful for identifying the scope of the Design Guidance, particularly how it should relate to other planning policy, the status it should be afforded and its general approach – which should be inspirational and encouraging as well as providing clear guidance on what is not acceptable.

Officer Workshop

In summary, the key points were:

- There's not much to celebrate in terms of quality design. The majority of Oldham and Rochdale is rather average, with small pockets of very poor quality environments.
- New estates lack character – don't relate to locality, led by standards (such as back-to-back distances).
- The road corridors have a very poor image and identity.
- The mills are good.
- Developers see 'good design' as having a high monetary cost. This is especially relevant on brownfield sites, which are already expensive to develop.
- Density standards are leading to better designs and a better mix of housing types.
- There are tensions between new design concepts and with highway safety issues. More guidance on highways is required.
- Planners and engineers need firm guidance to support negotiation and to refuse poor applications/win appeals. Planners are asking 'Is this refusable?' not 'Is this good design?'
- Low expectations – there is no culture of EXPECTING good design. We need to communicate that design isn't an optional extra.
- The SPD Documents need to be accessible to everyone.
- Lack of design skills amongst officers and members: training is needed.
- We need to create consensus of what good urban design is for Rochdale and Oldham by understanding the characteristics of the area.
- We should help developers and officers understand that good design goes beyond how things look.
- We should secure better quality design in smaller developments rather than trying to raise the standard over large areas.

5.3 The wider stakeholder workshop involved officers as well as wider stakeholders, and aimed to establish the range of options that the Design Guidance should

address. This workshop began by inviting stakeholders to think of good places (whether in the local area or further afield) and what characteristics made them good places to be. These are summarised below. Many of the characteristics are similar to the themes set out in By Design. In discussions on what the design guidance should address, there were a wide range of opinions, but also a group of themes that repeatedly came up in discussion.

Stakeholder Workshop

What Makes A Good Place?

- A good place is a safe place
- Links (within and outside)
- Accessibility and a range of uses
- Good quality buildings – scale
- Well defined spaces – public / private / communal
- Community ownership / pride
- Human Scale
- Good quality materials
- A clear function

What should the design guidance address?

- House extensions
- New Housing
- Existing terraced housing
- Treatment/use of mills
- Main corridors
- Landscaping / public realm
- Managing the car

What should the guidance comprise?

The client and consultant team met following the workshops to discuss what the guides should address from the range of options discussed at the workshops. It was decided that, in addition to an overall guide setting out design principles that apply to all forms of development in both boroughs, there would be further guidance relating to:

- New housing;
- Public Realm; and
- Design and Planning Process.

New housing is the principal form of development coming forward in the two Boroughs at present and in the foreseeable future, and so a guide on this topic would be particularly useful. House extensions are already reasonably well covered under various policies and existing Supplementary Planning Guidance, and so it was felt that this was not a good area in which to focus limited resources.

The improvement of existing streets and spaces, and the creation of new public realm was felt to be an important topic that forms the basis of many projects within both boroughs. A public realm design guide was therefore agreed upon. Managing

the car could form part of both this guide and the residential design guide. Similarly, main road corridors could be addressed in the public realm guide.

The processes underpinning design were not explicitly raised at the wider stakeholder workshop, but they proved a key area of discussion with officers. A good practice guide to the design and planning process was agreed as the third guide.

6. Stage Two: Testing the Content

6.1 The second stage of stakeholder workshops was held in August 2006. The same stakeholders who attended the Stage One workshops were invited to attend one of three workshop sessions over a single day. These sessions were structured as follows:

- a presentation to set the scene: reminding everyone of the role and purpose of the guides, and how the previous consultation workshops had informed them;
- a presentation of the Urban Design Guide and the Planning Process Guides, focussing on their structure and purpose rather than the detail of their content;
- a coffee break where stakeholders could quickly look at the guides, followed by a question and answer session at which any key points or misunderstandings could be clarified;
- a presentation of the Residential and the Public Realm Guide, again focussing on structure and purpose rather than detail;
- a coffee break where stakeholders could quickly look at the guides, followed by a question and answer session at which any key points or misunderstandings could be clarified; and
- the distribution of feedback forms, so that stakeholders could have a more thorough examination of the guides and provide detailed feedback to the client and consultant team.

6.2 The feedback forms encouraged stakeholders to provide feedback on the content, appearance and usability of the guides. The feedback was very positive and supportive and written responses from eighteen stakeholders were received, and a summary is provided below:

Stakeholder Comments on Developing Draft

APPEARANCE

There were a number of detailed points regarding typos, quality of illustrations, labelling etc but the key points were:

- the layout of the A4 documents is confusing. Text and images need to relate better to one another. It is not clear in which direction the pages should be read;
- many of the photos are rather dark; and
- some of the text is difficult to read – e.g. pale blue on a white background.

CONTENT

There were a number of detailed points about content, and the main concerns were:

- length and repetition, especially between the streets and spaces guidance in the Residential Design Guide and the Public Realm Design Guide;
- the new government circular on Design and Access Statements, and the CABI guidance, need to be reflected in the Process Guide;
- there is a widespread desire for the documents to relate more specifically to Oldham and Rochdale; and
- Residential density should be referred to.

USEABILITY

- Most consultees felt that the guides are clearly written, but a couple wanted less jargon
- The status of the guides and their relationship to other statutory documents needs to be made clearer.

- 6.3 In agreement with the client team, Tibbalds made a number of changes to the documents prior to statutory consultation to ensure that the feedback from key stakeholders had been taken on board as far as was possible.
- 6.4 A detailed schedule of all comments received during pre-draft consultation, and the consultants and client teams responses to these comments, can be found in Appendix 3.

7. Sustainability Appraisal

- 7.1 The Urban Design Guide SPD(s) has been tested for sustainability through the formal sustainability appraisal process. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report was sent to the following stakeholders for comment between 23rd May and 23rd June 2006:

- Environment Agency
- English Nature
- English Heritage
- The Countryside Agency
- Government Office for the North West
- North West Regional Assembly
- Greater Manchester Architectural Liaison Unit
- Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
- Greater Manchester Geological Unit
- Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit
- United Utilities

- 7.2 Following consideration of the responses on the proposed scope of the SA (see Appendix 1), which required minor changes, Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC carried out a detailed appraisal of the documents. The final Sustainability Appraisal has been published alongside the adopted Urban Design Guide SPD(s).

8. Equalities Impact Assessment

- 8.1 Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC have also carried out an Equalities Impact Assessment on the draft SPD(s) in order to assess the potential impact of the SPD(s) on the various equalities categories within the Boroughs. This was carried out by officers in the Strategic Planning and Information section at Oldham MBC and the Partnership and Regeneration Service at Rochdale MBC on 16th October 2006. The final Equalities Impact Assessment has been published alongside the adopted Urban Design Guide SPD(s).

9. Habitat Regulations Assessment

- 9.1 Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC have also carried out a Habitat Regulations Assessment as required under Article 6(3) and 6(4) of the Habitats Directive as implemented by the draft Habitat Regulations 2004. This involved consultation with the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and Natural England. The final Habitat Regulations Assessment has been published alongside the adopted Urban Design Guide SPD(s).

10. Approval of draft by Elected Council Members

- 10.1 Rochdale Council: The documents were presented to a panel of Cabinet and Township elected members on 16 November 2006. Whilst the documents were broadly welcomed and supported, a number of amendments were sought. The two most significant amendments were: a stronger statement about how the density of new housing development will be considered, and the need to consider 'maintenance' as a key issue and design principle. The Council's Cabinet formally approved a draft version of the documents as a basis for formal public participation on 27 November. 2006.
- 10.2 Oldham Council: The documents were presented to the Local Development Framework Members Panel on the 18th January 2007. Again the documents were broadly welcomed and supported, however there were concerns regarding local distinctiveness and that it is not addressed clearly enough in documents and that more specific guidance about what is appropriate in different areas should be included. In particular it is felt that there is the need for a clearer distinction about what is appropriate in urban, suburban and rural settings. It was agreed that consultation should proceed based on the documents in their present form and come to a final conclusion in the light of responses received. The Executive Director for Regeneration and Lead Member approved the draft SPD as a basis for formal public consultation on 16th February 2007.

11. Stage Three: Draft Consultation

- 11.1 Following the pre-draft consultation process described above, the documents were published for consultation on 9th March 2007, for a period of six weeks up until 20th April 2007.

- 11.2 Appendices 4 and 5 list the bodies who were consulted at this stage. All of these bodies were sent a representation form to fill out, a copy of which is included as Appendix 6 in this document.
- 11.3 A public note was published in the Oldham Evening Chronicle on 9th March 2007 and a press release with detail of the SPD was issued. A notice was placed in the Rochdale Observer on 8th March 2007 and the Middleton Guardian and Heywood Advertiser on the 9th March 2007.
- 11.4 The SPD(s) and its supporting documents were available on both Oldham MBC's and Rochdale MBC's website and at the deposit locations identified within the accompanying Statement of Availability.
- 11.5 A total of 22 representations were received from a diverse range of bodies. The schedule of responses is included as Appendix 7 in this document. Only a few respondents opted to use the form; most responded in letter form. Whilst the representations raised a large number of points about the layout and content of the documents, and suggested many ways of improving the documents / ensuring they covered all the necessary issues, there were no objections in principle to any part of the document which would have required substantial changes in the content of the documents. A few comments were also received in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitat Regulations Assessment and Equalities Impact Assessment.
- 11.6 The Councils have carefully considered all of the representations made in conjunction with Tibbalds and Oldham and Rochdale Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder. It has been possible to make changes in response to the majority of the representations, and there have been relatively few which have elicited no changes to the document. It is felt that this process has strengthened the documents and ensured they are comprehensive in their coverage of design issues that affect the Boroughs.
- 11.7 Paper copies of the SPD are available to purchase.
To order a copy, please contact:

Strategic Planning & Information
Regeneration Directorate
PO Box 452
Oldham Business Centre
Cromwell Street
Oldham
OL1 1WR

Telephone: 0161 770 4151

Email: spi@oldham.gov.uk

Planning & Regulation Service
Strategic Planning Team
Floor 2
Telegraph House
Baillie Street
Rochdale OL16 1JH

Telephone 01706 924371

strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk

Appendix 1 – Consultation on the Scoping Report – Comments received and Councils responses

| Respondent | Issue | Council Response |
|------------------|---|---|
| United Utilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan may wish to acknowledge that statutory undertakers have 5 year investment programmes set by the regulator. This is currently AMP4 between 2005-10. • It is possible to obtain a “good” score on BREAM criteria without attention to potable water saving measures. Various measures are suggested. • Unmetered water usage figures cannot be provided for each district. UU and national averages/trends provided. | <p>Noted. This is not appropriate detail for the SA Scoping Report.</p> <p>Noted. This indicator using BREAM may be changed/refined in the light of experience and subject to the availability of other practical indicators re: water usage/consumption.</p> <p>Noted. Background information about trends will be included in the SA Scoping Report.</p> |
| GMPTE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTP2 and the GM Accessibility Strategy needs to be referred to. • Accessibility to services by a choice of sustainable modes should be referred to as a sustainability issue. • Rewording of Objective K suggested. • The effect of traffic in the | <p>Noted and SA Scoping Report will be updated.</p> <p>There is appropriate reference to accessibility and modal choice for an Urban Design document. The level of detail suggested may be more appropriate for transport and travel related guidance.</p> <p>Noted. The objective is broader than the proposed change and there is sufficient detail in the supporting document.</p> <p>Noted. Too detailed for the SPD proposed. More</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | community could be broadened to include noise pollution and congestion including the economic impact. | appropriate in specific traffic and travel documents. |
| GMP Architectural Liaison Unit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high percentage of developments should be constructed to ODPM guideline standards in Safer Places and Secured by Design. • Proposals for new walkways, pedestrian and cycle routes should be approved only after consultation with GMP. • Suggests that all new development should be accredited the Safer by Design award/submitted to GMP for comment prior to approval. SBD should be included as a key target indicator. • Recognise crime and disorder as a key issue. | <p>Agreed. Reference will be made to these documents/standards re: PPS1 and 3.</p> <p>Noted. Detail to be discussed for inclusion in SPD.</p> <p>Noted. Detail to be discussed for inclusion in SPD. Further indicators such as SBD will be considered as refinements to SA monitoring.</p> <p>Noted. The text can refer to this as an issue.</p> |
| Countryside Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic advice provided for SA. • No reference is made to the Peak National Park | <p>Noted. Much of this relates to the wider countryside and is not specific to urban design issues. This will be useful for the wider SA of the developing LDF. Many of the existing key issues and indicators express the Agency's concerns with a specific urban angle.</p> <p>Oldham Borough characterisation will be amended to make reference to the Park National Park.</p> |
| Environment Agency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the document as written. | Noted. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An indicator is required to measure the number and type of habitat lost to development. Ponds will not provide a trend/position statement with all species and habitat. • An indicator used for prudent use of natural resources should be land reclaimed to beneficial use for all land uses. • There is a lack of information regarding sustainability issues around climate change. SUDS had not been mentioned. | <p>Noted. The indicators as listed will be expanded subject to the availability of monitoring data. The input of GMEU and Environment Agency to identifying further indicators and how they will be measured will be welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. This could be expanded subject to suitable data sources being available.</p> <p>Noted. Further climate change references will be considered as appropriate data sets are identified for the urban design focus of this SPD. SUDS is mentioned as an indicator.</p> |
|--|---|---|

Appendix 2 – Organisations / stakeholders consulted at each Pre-Draft stage

Reg 17 (b) (i) the names of any persons whom their authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD.

The following is an indicative list of those that were invited to take part in one or more of the workshops held during the preparation of the SPD(s):

- Officers from various departments within Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC, including planning, transportation, environmental services, corporate policy, equality and diversity unit, regeneration, community safety, town centre manager, housing strategy and Housing Market Renewal.
- External organisations, such as Countryside Agency, Rochdale Development Agency, English Partnerships, RENEW Northwest, GM Architectural Liaison Unit, English Heritage, Oldham and Rochdale Groundwork Trust, North West Regional Assembly, North West Development Agency, Government Office for the North West, Environment Agency, Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit, English nature, Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, CABI, and University of Manchester.
- Selected Community Groups, such as Littleborough Civic Trust, Littleborough Historical and Archaeological Society, Pennines Environment Group, Rochdale Environment Working party, Saddleworth Parish Council, Oldham Access Group, Oldham Civic Trust and Saddleworth Civic Trust.
- Selected Developers.
- Selected Councillors from Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC.

Appendix 3 – Consultation at Pre-Draft stages – Comments received and Consultants / Client Team responses

FEEDBACK - URBAN DESIGN GUIDE

| Consultee | Comment | Response |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Government Office for the North West | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific comments, but notes that Guides are Useful and clearly written | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required |
| 2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The opening statements were O.K <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction is difficult to read in terms of layout and colour | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Layout of introduction amended |
| 3. Home Builders Federation | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The urban design principles identified in this guide are generally supported <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated Local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guide included a lot of text, so a summary, or checklist of issues may be useful | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees. Concerned that a ‘checklist’ approach would mean that (i) people would not read the body of the document; and (ii) good design may be considered as a series of boxes to be ticked where, in fact, it is more complicated than that. |
| 4. Gleeson Regeneration | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attractive Layout, horrible colour combination <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to use and useful | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the only comment received on colour combination, so have not changed it |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>5. Rochdale Development Agency</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fairly generic, with a lack of reference to specific qualities of Oldham & Rochdale It needs to be made clear how the SPD relates to both 'higher' and 'lower' level documents, e.g. UDPs and development briefs There is repetition between the documents, and its unclear as to whom the documents are aimed. It may be worth condensing the design principles into one small 'quick reference' booklet The emphasis of all the documents is very much on the residential development, and neglects the issue of town centre developments, of which there is a significant amount in Rochdale The canal-side development is also neglected. The chapters on sustainability contain a significant amount of repetition, and it may be useful to combine the chapters <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 11/12, it may be useful to have pictures of Oldham and Rochdale to illustrate these points rather than 'generic' ones Page 16, a photograph of Middleton bus station could be used to illustrate the point in the section Page 24, a photograph of Globe House in Rochdale could be used to illustrate this point It may be less confusing if the document was portrait in format <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tried to include more photos of Oldham and Rochdale in revised documents The relationship between the SPD and relevant UDP policies is explained and has been further clarified. There is inevitably some repetition as it is intended that each document is largely free standing and aimed at housing developers, those who are involved in the design of the public realm. They are topic based and it is clear to all what the focus of each is. The 'Guide to Good Practice' document explains how these and UDP policies should be used to identify design issues. The Design Principles should apply to all developments and the Public Realm Guide will be relevant to town centre schemes. The consultation with stakeholders clearly identified that detailed guidance on Residential Development and Public Realm were the priorities. Explanation as to why principles may seem quite general included Introduction amended to make it clearer who should be using the documents Additional references to canals inserted, and photos of more non-residential uses included; Believe that it is important to emphasise that sustainability should apply to layout as well as to buildings themselves, so have retained two sections. Quick reference booklet may be an interesting idea – to be explored. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where good quality photos have been supplied, these have been added into the document Residential guide has been amended to portrait format so that landscape vs. portrait debate can be had during statutory consultation |
| <p>6. Great Places Housing</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments made on Urban Design Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None required |

| Association | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>7. Oldham MBC – Cllr Roger Hindle</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None required |
| <p>8. Artisan</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles are set out effectively and clearly explained <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the photos are too small and lose their impact • Showing good and bad examples is very useful <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a series rather than one large document with sub-sections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have not changed photo sizes but have lightened them / sorted out printing problem (where they appeared to dark) to make them more readable |
| <p>9. Oldham MBC Strategy & Resources Directorate</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging • The BRE Eco-homes standard covers far more than purely buildings and should therefore be referenced in the UDG document • No reference has been made to the need to consider district heating schemes and how schemes can be fuelled (e.g. gas or biomass fuelled CHP) • Appendix A of part 7b needs to reference Oldham Borough's forthcoming Renewables SPD (March 2007) • Adaptation to Climate Change is a significant issue within Urban Design, and is not explicitly referenced; it should be included where reference is made to SUDS rainwater recovery systems, flood plain issues, projected increases in solar gain/need for additional cooling etc • Reference should be made to the existence of the Renewable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to EcoHomes introduced • Ref to fuelling district heating included • Appendix A limited to UDPs, so do not plan to start to introduce reference to SPDs • Not providing detailed wording of other policies (as appendix would get very long), so have not introduce it for this one ▪ Further detail has been included on sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency all of which is intended to combat climate change. Further explanatory text would introduce unnecessary detail. |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>SPD. Within the UDG Principles section 7, 7a, 7b, it might be more appropriate to detail the specific NR3.3 RUDP Policy wording, that the 10% is a requirement above developments of 10 residential units and 1000m2 in Oldham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oldham image on page 31, showing pavement materials that relate to the character of the area, note that the paving in the images has since been removed and replaced with tarmac • Under the general principle of ‘poor designs are unacceptable’, how will such designs be assessed against this good/best practice? <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design standards of the documents are excellent <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design. • The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit • Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG & PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion | <p>????</p> <p>?????</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graphic showing hierarchy introduced to all four documents • Introduction revised to make purpose clearer • Separate guides liked by many, and agreed as the way forward by Oldham MBC, Rochdale MBC and Oldham Rochdale Partners in Action. NOT SURE ABOUT THIS STATEMENT GIVEN THAT THIS IS STILL AN ISSUE FOR US. <i>We could say;</i> • There are mixed views on whether one larger design guide would be preferable to three smaller guides. We will await the results of consultation on the drafts before considering this further. |
| <p>10. Sustainability Northwest</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 needs to mention the importance of ensuring the street lighting is as energy efficient as possible • Section 4 should note that waiting areas should be provided which are considered safe and out of the weather • Having two sections – 7 (sustainability) and 9 (Good Sustainable Buildings) may be confusing due to overlapping, so these could be combined and also make mention of the ‘Building for Life’ standard • Section 7a could add that proposals should ensure there is a high efficiency through incorporating elements such as high thermal mass wall materials, green roofs etc, and that EcoHomes should meet the ‘very good’ standard • Section 7b could mention; renewable energy technologies, and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ref. to energy efficient lighting included • Ref. to waiting areas included • See comments above regarding separate sections for layout and buildings • EcoHomes ‘very good’ introduced. Other proposals too specific for this overall guide. Resi guide has more detail on this. • Flexibility reference included • Water recycling, flooding included |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>that developments should be flexible to allow the future implementation of renewable energy technologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 7c should mention grey water recycling, and measures to reduce the risk of flooding • Section 7e should recommend the use of native species in planting, and no mention is made of ensuring the most effective and efficient use of land • Section 8f should include the idea of using paving and surfacing materials that are reclaimed and recycled (locally if possible) • Section 9b should recommend that as many construction materials as possible should be A-rated (BRE Green Guide), and timber should be from sustainable sources • Section 9g, it is important to make clear that materials with high environmental performance can also be of good quality • It may be useful to raise the issue of the sustainability performance of developers themselves; do they have an environmental management systems, what measures do they take to reduce their construction waste etc? <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ref. to native species included • Reclaimed / recycled materials included • Construction materials amended • Outside of the scope of this guide, which focuses more on physical design |
| 11. David Mycock | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments provided on Urban Design Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |
| 12. The Impact Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified • A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides. • The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs. • At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Has this been done – I cant remember?</i> • Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides • Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides. • LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>weight as the UDP.</p> <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | <p>LDS</p> |
| <p>13. Oldham Environment Partnership</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The documents lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues, such as supporting community cohesion or raising the image of the Boroughs and their industrial heritage • Page iv paragraph 2, refers to providing a greater sense of involvement in the planning and development processes, yet there is only reference in the documents to consultation after the design stage, therefore where can the public feel they have influenced the design from this? • 1b Character: Who will decide which the unattractive or inappropriate buildings are? • 2. Safety and inclusion: The need for good lighting must be balanced against energy needs and light pollution • 3b Diversity: Pictures in the documents do not show a diverse community either in age or race • 4. Ease of movement: Generally an excellent section. • 7. Sustainability: Should this not be higher up the list? • 7d Waste: Perhaps its needed to set out the space needed for all our various recycle bins etc. Should it be specified that developments over a certain size should have their own recycling centres? • 7e bio-diversity: Needs to reference the incorporation of native plants and trees as food for birds, insects etc. • 9 Good sustainable buildings: Excellent <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure <p><u>Usability:</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>There is a limit to the extent top which a design guide can raise these issues although the design principles will help to address them. Other documents and heritage assessments for certain areas will be used to identify potential for image improvement and features of interest and use when considering design and planning applications.</u> • Introduction changed to included text related to raising the image. • References to consultation (especially in Process Guide) amended to make clear that it should happen during the design process and not just after • 1b: developers and the LPA will need to agree this together as part of the design and planning application process • Lighting – text amended • Diversity – HMR asked to supply pictures that better reflect the local area • List derived from consultation, and other principles considered more important • 7d – too specific for this guide • Ref. to native plants included |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | |
| <p>14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taken together all four guides are very long - if the intended users have to plough through all the material to find the detail, they may be discouraged and not bother. So, some way of summarising the main points, meaningfully and not blandly, and signposting detail would help. Could be an "Anytown" guide to design. More content on specific local forms of design (good and bad); some commentary on local vernacular styles of architecture and local materials needed. The Borough Renaissance Masterplan and Gateways and Corridors Strategy seem to have been overlooked "easy maintenance" should be one of the key design principles; designers should not only think about "easy maintenance" as one of their key considerations in the design process but also actively involve the agencies responsible for maintenance at an early stage - a point which the Guide to Good Practice could make Page 10 - the guide doesn't fully explain the assertion that "diverse environments support social cohesion and understanding." Pages 11 and 12 are among the most vague and bland parts of the documents Page 16, 4b says developments "should ensure... local and corner shops within 400 metres." What if those aren't viable? Page 23 - 6a requires principal roads to be "designed to ensure" that they are "capable of accommodating increases or decreases in the demand" for use. What does that imply in practice? Is there a danger that this could encourage the design of excessive capacity at new junctions. How does the guide expect the five points in 6a to be balanced and prioritised? What is most important? Page 27 - 7b - why at least 10%? Why not more or less? Page 39 - 9c - this would be a good place to give some specific local examples. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See concerns about summary / tick box above More local examples introduced Borough Masterplan and Gateways and Corridors Study have informed the guides Principles are derived from three sources (consultation, urban design best practice and analysis of the local area). Maintenance – whilst a concern – is not considered a principle of making good places in its own right: it is a process that supports places that have already been designed using the nine principles. However, now included as a principle. The role of diversity in supporting social cohesion by reflecting specific local needs is explained under 3a, 3b and 3c on the following pages. Reference to including agencies involved in future maintenance in the design process added Pages 11 and 12 reworded to make them more specific and easier to read 4b amended to be more general about facilities within walking distance 6a amended to address this point 10% derived from OMBC planning policy Agree: however do not currently have suitable images – suggest that this is addressed during / following statutory consultation period. Problem of dark images addressed (see above) |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lot of jargon which makes it hard to follow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be examined and improvements made. Have amended text to make it easier to understand where possible. |
| 15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2a Include reference to avoiding segregation of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles; routes should be as straight and wide as possible; avoid underpasses, subways, footbridges etc 2C development should be influenced by 'Secured By Design' standards <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text amended |
| 16. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments on Urban Design Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required |
| 17 | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be more local flavour Celebrating water could be brought out more Reference to appropriate density needs to be included Do we need to say something about historic environments? Too much repetition <p><u>Appearance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confusion about the hierarchy of headings Landscape format is confusing – should you read across or down the pages? The introductory pages need breaking up with better headings, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More local photos introduced Density referred to in Resi Guide Guidance applies to <i>all</i> areas, including historic environments Documents need to stand alone, so there is some repetition between them. Hierarchy of headings addressed Resi Guide produced in portrait to help debate on format during consultation Introduction reworked |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | <p>coloured boxes etc – too heavy, and needs to be made more accessible.</p> <p><u>Useability</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can Tibbalds do a jargon check? • A policy table needs to be included in the Residential and Public Realm Guides as well | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language simplified where possible • Policy tables will be provided. |
| 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |

FEEDBACK – DESIGN & PLANNING PROCESS: GUIDE TO GOOD PRACTICE

| Consultee | Comment | Response |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. GONW | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question the need for 'Guide to Good Practice' to be produced as an SPD, rather than as part of the LDF <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Useful and clearly written | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status to be discussed. |
| 2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject matter very dry • Page 5 – Key Messages are good • Page 11 – what does topography mean? <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps on pages 34/35 are very small, and people will struggle to read them • Headings at the top of the pages are not necessary – detailing the subject matter <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Book is a good size • Text could be bigger for the a visual impairment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content is intended to provide a procedural tool and has been broken up into discreet sections and illustrated to make it easy to use. • Feel that text following topography ('Does the site slope?' explains this) • Intended as an overall example of a page layout, rather than encouraging people to read the plans – so no change • Headings retained to aid navigation <p>Text size consistent for all four documents. Retained at this stage, although issue needs to be discussed with client team</p> |
| 3. Home Builders Federation | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be appropriate to update page 17 referring to PPG3, but not draft PPS3 • Welcome the inclusion of the Design Statement section • Checklist in section 8 will be very useful to developer, house builders etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended to refer to PPS3 ▪ Noted ▪ Noted |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated • Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate • The users of this guide need to be clearly identified in the introduction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees. • SPD status to be debated • Users already identified in introduction |
| <p>4. Gleeson Regeneration</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |
| <p>5. Rochdale Development Agency</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 15 should refer to flooding as a 'key technical issue' (of particular reference to ECR sites) • Page 17 should be DCLG not ODPM • Page 36, the planning process checklist is limited, RMBC have their own checklist which is far more comprehensive <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding included • DCLG included • Planning process kept simple – however, to be reviewed following statutory consultation |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>6. Great Places Housing Association</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent guide, that steers you through the process well and avoid a lot of planning jargon and technical references • Clarification as to whether the design principles on page 19 are of a typical scheme? If so, it should say, otherwise one would think it applies to all schemes. • Should make reference to CABE's publication "Design and Access Statements – how to write, read and use them"? <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good size, overall very good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification provided that principles are for imaginary scheme • Reference made to CABE's Design and Access Statements document |
| <p>7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>8. Artisan</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This document is of more use to the non-professional, as Architects would be expected to follow this process as a matter of course <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some photos are too small • The use of bullet points is clear and useful <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pocket size format makes it very user friendly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action taken – size of document limits size of photos, and most are only providing a ‘flavour’ of the point rather than trying to illustrate something specific |
| <p>9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design standards of the documents are excellent <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design. • The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit • Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG & PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments on consultee 9 above ▪ Points covered above. |
| <p>10. Sustainability Northwest</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 15 should mention the issue of good cycle routes under ‘transport’, and the use of SUDS under ‘drainage’ • Section 4 should ensure that sustainability criteria are included within the development brief, e.g. meeting EcoHomes ‘Very Good’ , and requirements could be incentivised • Section 6 – Would a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) be needed in certain instances? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle routes included • Flooding / SUDs included • Sustainability included in Briefing process • Guide makes clear it does not deal with EIA – same goes for SEA |

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| | <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | |
| 11. David Mycock | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments provided on Process Guide | |
| 12. The Impact Partnership | <p><u>i) Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides. The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs. At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP. Page 15 has no mention of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need to ensure that we enhance road safety in the locality reviewing the existing recoded injury accident record in the area and how the development may improve or make this worse walking and cycling access and links to facilities and transport Page 24 has no mention of consulting the local highway authority or in some instances the highways agency if near the motorways or Oldham Broadway Page 28, great mention is made of the need for an EA no mention is made of the need for a Transport assessment and that this may need a considerable time to undertake prior to application. A meeting with the highway authority to agree the scope of the study prior to commissioning work is strongly advised to avoid the application being refused in an inadequate TA. Page 36 – should there be a checklist EIA and TA? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See response above. Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides. LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS References added Reference introduced to consulting highway authority Reference already made to a TA – but now strengthened in relation to ES Checklist amended |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | |
| 13. Oldham Environment Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the early involvement of the community? Consultation after the design stage means, the planners are reluctant to reassess initial assumptions and the community feel they are being offered a fait accompli. It would be much better to have some involvement at the concept phase where the local community can spell out their hopes and particular needs. <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation process text amended to include reference to consultation during design process and not just after |
| 14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments about Process Guide <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Agree, the quality of photographs and the printing process will be addressed.</u> |
| 15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction should include references to sustainable communities • Reference should be made to secured by Design • The Guide should acknowledge the Crime and Disorder Act <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading <p><u>Usability:</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These issues not relevant to this guide and are covered elsewhere |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be a very useful practical tool with some fine adjustment | |
| 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Process Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |
| 17 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Process Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |
| 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides detailed identification of typos | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All points addressed through revisions |

Feedback – Residential Design Guide

| Consultee | Comment | Response |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 1. GONW | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comments on Residential Guide | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required |
| 2. Oldham MBC – Derker Programme | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is repetition between this guide (Section 4) and the PRDG It would be useful to include some statistics of people interviewed regarding HomeZone, such as age groups, to indicate how the decision was made to transform an area to HomeZone <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good combination of text, photos and diagrams to provide examples of both good and bad practice Some photos are dark making it difficult to visualise the points they are making, repetitive photos for each guide would be better with different examples Some jumbled layouts and poor use of graphic text colours <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complicated English and graphics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guides need to stand alone, so repetition remains Statistics would be rather too detailed for this guide. Dark photos addressed Colour of caption text changed from pale blue to black Have tried to simplify language where possible |
| 3. Home Builders Federation | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repetition between the public realm section in this document and the stand alone public realm document, could be referenced instead <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guides need to stand alone, so repetition remains Would welcome examples of good practice. However – despite requests – few examples have been forthcoming from consultees. <u>Agreed. The documents will be kept under review and their implementation will be assessed through Oldham and</u> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The users of this guide were clearly identified in the introduction | <u>Rochdale's Annual Monitoring Reports.</u> |
| 4. Gleeson Regeneration | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action required |
| 5. Rochdale Development Agency | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 41, chapter 6, should be the most important but actually receives the least attention, more explanation of the principles would be helpful and the first paragraph should be emphasised <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes made. However, to be looked at in more detail during / after statutory consultation if required. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>6. Great Places Housing Association</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific reference to topography, and a lot of sites in Oldham & Rochdale are steeply sloping • The Didsbury Point example on page 27 shows how parking can be placed in front of a house successfully, yet the text states; "Parking in front of dwellings is discouraged". <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally very good, however some photos seem dark and gloomy • Good mixture of real example and illustrative diagrams <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure why the layout is landscape? • Good length – making it more readable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both points addressed • Dark photos addressed • Format changed to portrait to allow debate / comparison during consultation so that final version can be agreed |
| <p>7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action required |
| <p>8. Artisan</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable approach but could have included more on materials and the impact of good/bad choices • Repetition throughout the 'suite' of documents, but this is inevitable and does help to emphasise points <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good illustrations <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No action taken |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | series rather than one large document with sub-sections | |
| 9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging • The encouragement of all new dwellings to meet eco-homes 'good' standard as a minimum is not stretching enough; this should be set at 'very good'. • No reference has been made to the need to consider district heating schemes and how schemes can be fuelled (e.g. gas or biomass fuelled CHP) <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The design standards of the documents are excellent <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design. • The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit • Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG & PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Very Good' inserted • District heating fuel consideration introduced <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagram introduced to demonstrate hierarchy • See comments above about stand alone / combined guides |
| 10. Sustainability Northwest | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4 – Car Parking, should raise the issue of reducing car parking available as an incentive to use public transport and other sustainable transport methods, reference could be made to BedZed • Section 4 – Green Spaces, should recommend that native species be used in planting • Section 5 – Sustainable Design, all new dwellings should meet the EcoHomes 'very good' rather than just 'good'; also mention that reducing the demand for energy can be achieved through high levels of insulation and energy efficient lights and appliances; and sustainable lifestyles can be encouraged by providing new home owners with information on the use of environmental features <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three points reflected in amended text |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | |
| 11. David Mycock | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments provided on Residential Guide | |
| 12. The Impact Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides. The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs. At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP. <p>• No comments on appearance and useability</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See above. Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides. LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS |
| 13. Oldham Environment Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The documents cover most of the important issues on environment and sustainability, however they lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have tried to introduce more local examples in photos |
| 14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guides are very generalised, apart from a few local examples, mostly in photos, it could be an "Anytown" guide to design. Page 6, it should be stated that the plans on this and following | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have tried to introduce more local examples in photos Have reinforced references to imaginary site |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>pages are purely hypothetical otherwise it may be confusing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 21, here (and on page 13 of the public realm guide) it says that 20mph "is the maximum speed that will be permitted." Is that a proposed new policy? If so has it been formally adopted or will it need specific consideration by the authorities? • Pages 33 & 34, this is a place where the links between the photos and text need to be improved. • There is no reference to density. Isn't that a design issue? I think relatively high densities should be encouraged, not least because this reduces pressure on green field sites and supports the viability of community facilities, such as the corner shops referred-to above and public transport <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lot of jargon which makes it hard to follow | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20mph – see policy A/9 of adopted Rochdale UDP in relation to residential roads • Revised layout may overcome this problem • Density reference strengthened, and new page introduced. • Darkness of photos addressed, which should help clarity – size remains the same • Relationship between text and pictures: revised layout should help • Other consultees praise the simple language. Nevertheless, have tried to simplify language where possible |
| <p>15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear parking in courtyards should be designed to be secure using changes in paving, road surface, texture, landscape and signage. • In curtilage parking is the preferred option whenever possible from a security point of view. Low level shrubs can soften the visual impact. • Garages provide the ultimate security. • Mews houses are successful in reducing levels of anti-social behaviour. Where they are used, the first floor should overhang by one metre to deter people climbing in. <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good appearance with a pleasing balance of text and illustration making for easier reading | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security issues relating to rear courtyards already covered in design guide • <u>Noted. The guide acknowledges that visual impact can be reduced by low level shrubs</u> • Guidance on mews houses rather prescriptive. If they overhang, does that mean that people inside the mews house would not be able to look out of the window to see who was at their front door? Not included. |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be a very useful practical tool with some fine adjustment | |
| 16 | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Series of detailed points (typos, errors on key etc) provided • Plan needed for experimental layouts to bring it into line with the other ‘learning from Oldham and Rochdale’ images • Density – needs to relate to character • 20mph – has this been agreed with engineers? • Has preference for horizontal traffic calming been agreed with engineers? • Bringing it all together is rather too brief and ends a bit abruptly. <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout, especially of introductory pages, is not great. Needs to look more ‘snazzy’. <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings confusing • Reference to relevant policies would be helpful | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All detailed points picked up • Plan provided • Density strengthened in relation to character • 20mph in planning policy – see above • Engineers consulted in same way as all others: at officer workshops. • Text added to end of final section. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout and graphics changed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings made clearer • Policy table provided as appendix |
| 17 | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings confusing • Landscape layout confusing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings made clearer • Layout changed to portrait |
| 18 | No comments on Residential Guide | |

Feedback – Public Realm Design Guide

| Response | Comment | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>1. GONW</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Useful and clearly written | |
| <p>2. Oldham MBC – Darker Programme</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intended audience for the guide is given in the last sentence of the Introduction and the type of multi-disciplinary team referred to is the last paragraph on page 49; perhaps the two could be brought together, expanded, and given greater prominence in the Introduction Page 6 the ‘good streets above’ then reversing for ‘good spaces below’ is found confusing Page 12, the sketch ‘fit streets between the buildings’ is confusing, if a street had been drawn in it would have been clearer The language is confusing; words such as ‘pantechnican’, ‘setts’ and ‘echelon’ should be substituted with their more common forms Page 45/46 - the comparison is confusing; firstly the second layout has wider roads, and isn’t clear if that was because of complete demolition. The partial demolition was clear although the after photographs did not match <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The good and bad examples were very helpful illustrations of the text The small blue print around the photos was difficult to read Some photos are dark making it difficult to visualise the points they are making, repetitive photos for each guide would be better with different examples | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction amended, but may still need to revisit this point Page 6 – amended Page 12 – not amended: taken from Places, Streets and Movement, and difficult to see how to improve it Confusing language simplified 45/46 – width marginally wider for one street, other street the same width: to be amended following statutory consultation 45/46 – captions to photos added to explain that they are illustrative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Blue captions changes to black Darkness of photos addressed |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|
| | <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | |
| 3. Home Builders Federation | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The photographs and diagrams are useful however it is important they are not over complicated Any local examples of good practice could be made available from house builders that work in the area <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It needs to be made clear what weight these guides will be given when deciding planning applications. It also needs to be demonstrated that the usefulness and implementation of the guidance will be monitored and reviewed as appropriate The users of this guide need to be clearly identified in the introduction | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. The use of photographs and diagrams will be further examined/improved. See comments above regarding examples of good practice. See earlier response |
| 4. Gleeson Regeneration | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informative <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well laid out <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy to use | |
| 5. Rochdale Development Agency | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference to 'street-by-street' basis of street furniture should be removed in favour of co-ordination of street furniture over a wider area in order to achieve the objectives of strong character and ease of maintenance There is a strong focus on residential development, and its worth noting that a significant amount of change planned for the public realm in Rochdale Borough is planned for town centre areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have been unable to locate this reference – to be amended if it is still there following statutory consultation More images on non-residential development introduced Guidance on non-residential car parking expanded Hierarchy not revised |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 27, it may be helpful to revise the 'hierarchy' of roads types as part of the Rochdale Borough gateways and corridors strategy in relation to this page There is a contradiction between page 28 and 36 in regards to low planting strips Page 39/40 – the 'furniture zone' section doesn't offer any guidance for what to do when there is a narrower footway, and there is a conflict between the two sets of diagrams on page 40 The reference to DB32 when considering highways issues will be replaced in 2007 by the Manual for Streets, which takes very different views to the DB32, and it would be useful to take account of this change in situation. There is repetition between this document and the RDG and UDG <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More photographs of Rochdale and Oldham Boroughs would be good Page 40 – some of these drawings are difficult to read Page 42, it is difficult to pick out the numbers on the right hand plan <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contradiction between 28 and 36 removed 'where possible' added to deal with issue of narrower pavements References to Manual for Streets introduced Repetition a necessary evil as documents need to stand alone More local photos introduced Numbers clarified |
| 6. Great Places Housing Association | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments provided | |
| 7. Oldham MBC – Councillor Roger Hindle | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good | |
| 8. Artisan | <p><u>Content:</u></p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The best guide from a content and illustration point of view, the various points are well explained and some of the before and after views, and annotated are very good <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good photos and drawings <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The format is very user friendly, and it benefits from being part of a series rather than one large document with sub-sections | |
| <p>9. Oldham MBC Strategy and Resources Directorate</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive in scope, accessible and engaging Overlaps with pages 19-32 of the RDG in terms of public realm design, at the very least cross-referencing is required. <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design standards of the documents are excellent <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hierarchy of documents is not clear on initial readings; this could be clarified through text/graphic design. The purpose of each document and relevant audience needs to be made explicit Could these documents be combined to form a single urban design guide with overview/summary (UDG) and detail (RDG & PRDG) with Design and Planning Process Guide as an appendix? To avoid duplication, and reduce confusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed there is some overlap, but the guides are intended to be self contained as far as possible. Diagram on hierarchy introduced See comments above regarding combined / separate documents |
| <p>10. Sustainability Northwest</p> | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2, could recommend the use of recycled and reclaimed materials and/or materials of low environmental impact Section 3, could mention the use of native species <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both points picked up |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | |
| 11. David Mycock | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments provided | |
| 12. The Impact Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legal weighting of these documents needs to be clarified A fundamental requirement on all road design is that it is safe for purpose. This is a legal responsibility on all parties to the design. To ensure this occurs we require all road improvements to be safety audited by the Highway Authorities safety auditor. Please ensure this requirement appears in all four guides. The two Councils have adopted a requirement for walking and cycling audits on all schemes. There is also the need to consult with disabled groups over the designs. At no point in any document is the Local transport Plan mentioned which is a statutory document and carries the same weight as the UDP Page 27 is a very poor plan and misses most of the strategic road network – it either needs completely redrawing or deleting <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>See earlier response.</u> Reference to requirement for road safety audit introduced into Residential, Public Realm and Process Guides Detailed points that should follow on from requirements for connected places, creating pedestrian friendly environments and consultation, so not included in guides. LTP not mentioned – SPD intended to supplement policy in LDS Plan deleted |
| 13. Oldham Environment Partnership | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The documents lack Oldham/Rochdale specific issues, such as supporting community cohesion or raising the image of the Boroughs and their industrial heritage This document is good, in that working with people covers community involvement, but surely this should be at the front There could be a greater emphasis on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection and restoration of buildings and features cherished by the community Prominent examples of renewable energy projects; wildlife projects; heritage crafts and tradition projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>There is a limit to the extent to which a design guide can raise these issues although the design principles will help to address them. Other documents and heritage assessments for certain areas will be used to identify potential for image improvement and features of interest and use when considering design and planning applications.</u> More local photos introduced Working with people specifically relates to Home Zones. Putting at the front would be confusing, as the focus of the |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public spaces where people can gather to hold outdoor meetings, community events, or view giant screens - Street, neighbourhood, and locality naming so people can more easily direct strangers and talk about where they live and work. - Recreational facilities in the spaces between diverse communities so they can more naturally meet and share experiences <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attractively presented in simple English with a logical structure <p><u>Usability:</u> No Comment</p> | <p>document should be on the physical design of streets and spaces – although that should, of course, involve consultation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to insert these detailed points into the current structure of the document – hard to see where they 'belong'. |
| 14. Rochdale MBC – Roger Ellis | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The guides are very generalised, apart from a few local examples, mostly in photos, it could be an "Anytown" guide to design. • Page 14 has the best reference to maintenance but should have more prominence and should be made explicit in the process guide <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout and appearance of the documents is good and clear, although most of the pictures are rather dark and small and therefore difficult to read. The relationship between text and pictures on each page isn't always clear and it may be better to refer in the text to photos which illustrate the points being made <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More local photos introduced • Maintenance strengthened throughout the guides • Darkness of photos addressed • Agreed. This will be addressed and improvements made. |
| 15. Oldham MBC Community Safety Unit | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments identical to those for Residential Guide and Urban Design Guide | <p>Actions as for Residential Guide and Urban Design Guide</p> |
| 16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Public Realm Design Guide | |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| 17 | <p><u>Content:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beefing up the guidance on green issues and open space would be useful • Reference to integration with landscape, access to countryside around towns, retaining moorland views would be helpful. <p><u>Appearance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific comments <p><u>Usability:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings confusing • Landscape layout confusing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greenspaces text introduced • PRDG is not the place to cover the points about access and views – not included. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hierarchy of headings clarified • Landscape layout retained, but Residential Guide changed to portrait to enable debate on format as part of statutory consultation |
| 18 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments on Public Realm Design Guide | |

Appendix 4 – Specific Consultation Bodies and Government Departments who were consulted on the SPD (s)

The following bodies are specific consultation bodies who were consulted by Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004:

- The Regional Planning Body (North West Regional Assembly)
- The Environment Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
- Natural England
- The Highways Agency
- Local Planning Authorities, County Councils or Parish Councils, any part of whose area is in or adjoins the Borough
- A Regional Development Agency whose area is in or adjoins the Boroughs
- Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under Section 106 (3) (a) of the Communications Act 2003
- Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the Boroughs
- The Strategic Health Authority
- A person to whom a licence has been granted under Section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986
- A sewage undertaker
- A water undertaker

Government Departments

The **Government Office for the North West** will be consulted by the Council and will be the first point of contact for consultation with the following Government Departments:

- Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES)
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
- Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)
- Department for Transport (DfT)
- Home Office

In addition, the Councils will consult the following Government Departments, where appropriate:

- Department of Health (through Regional Public Health Group)
- Ministry of Defence
- Department of Work and Pensions
- Department of Constitutional Affairs
- Office of Government Commerce (Property Advisors to the Civil Estate)

Appendix 5 - General and Other Consultees

The following bodies are general consultation bodies who were consulted by Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004:

- Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the Borough
- Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying out business in the Borough

Other Consultees

Rochdale MBC and Oldham MBC also consulted the following agencies and organisations who had asked to be notified or who were likely to be interested in the design guidance:

- Ancient Monuments Society
- Age Concern
- Airport Operators
- British Chemical Distributors and Traders Association
- British Geological Survey
- British Waterways, canal owners and navigation authorities
- Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA)
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
- Chambers of Commerce, local Confederation of British Industry and local branches of Institute of Directors
- Church Commissioners
- Civil Aviation Authority
- Coal Authority
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment
- Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Country Land & Business Association
- Crown Estate Office
- Diocesan Board of Finance
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee (now part of the Inclusive Environment Group)
- Electricity, Gas and Telecommunications Undertakers, and the National Grid Company
- Environmental groups at national, regional and local level, including:
 - (i) Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lancashire branch only)
 - (ii) Friends of the Earth
 - (iii) Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
 - (iv) Wildlife Trusts
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Fire and Rescue Services
- Forestry Commission

- Freight Transport Association
- The Garden History Society
- The Georgian Group
- Gypsy Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- Help the Aged
- The Home Builders Federation
- Housing Corporation
- Lancashire Wildlife Trust
- Learning and Skills Councils
- Local Agenda 21 including:
 - (i) Civic Societies
 - (ii) Community Groups
 - (iii) Local Transport Authorities
 - (iv) Local Transport Operators
 - (v) Local Race Equality Councils and other local equality groups
- National Playing Fields Association
- National Trust
- Network Rail
- New Heart for Heywood
- Passenger Transport Authorities
- Passenger Transport Executives
- The Planning Inspectorate
- Police Architectural Liaison Officers / Crime Prevention Design Advisors
- Port Operators
- Powergen Limited
- Rail Companies and the Rail Freight Group
- Regional Housing Boards
- Regional Sports Boards
- Road Haulage Association
- Royal Mail Group plc
- The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
- Sport England
- The Theatres Trust
- Traveller Law Reform Coalition
- The Twentieth Century Society
- The Victorian Society
- Water Companies
- Women's National Commission

LDF Mailing List

Oldham MBC and Rochdale MBC will also notify those individuals and organisations on their respective LDF mailing lists that consultation is underway on the draft SPD(s) and accompanying documents.

Appendix 6 – Design Guidance Representation Form

REPRESENTATION FORM FOR OBJECTING TO OR SUPPORTING THE DRAFT URBAN DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT(S) AND THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council and Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council will arrange for this document to be made available in alternative formats including large print, electronically, and community languages if requested, and subject to resources being available. For further information please contact ring Oldham MBC on 0161 770 4139, 4163 or 4151, or Rochdale MBC on 01706 924369 or 01706 924371.

Introduction

- Draft guidance on urban design has been prepared by consultants, Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design, in partnership with Rochdale MBC, Oldham MBC and the Oldham and Rochdale Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.
- The guidance is made of a series of documents:
 - The Urban Design Guide;
 - The Residential Design Guide; and
 - The Public Realm Design Guide.
- The guidance has been prepared through joint-working by the four partners identified above. However it is the intention that Oldham MBC will adopt the series of documents as one Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as outlined in it's Local Development Scheme (LDS). Rochdale MBC are intending to adopt the documents as a series of separate SPDs as identified in it's LDS.
- The draft Urban Design SPD(s) is supported by the following documents on which comments are also invited:
 - Sustainability Appraisal;
 - Habitat Regulations Assessment; and
 - Equalities Impact Assessment.
- Please use this form to make your representation on the draft Urban Design SPD(s) and any of its supporting documents.
- You are advised to read the guidance notes below before completing this form.
- Please use separate forms for each document that you are commenting on.
- **Comments on the SPD(s) and supporting documents must be received by 5.00 pm on 16th April 2007 at:**

| | Rochdale MBC | Oldham MBC |
|--------------------|---|---|
| By post to: | Strategic Planning Team, Floor 2, Telegraph House, Baillie Street, Rochdale, OL16 1JH | Strategic Planning and Information, Regeneration Directorate, Oldham MBC, PO Box 452, Oldham Business |

By fax: 01706 86 4144

By email: Strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk

The form can also be downloaded on the Council websites and posted or emailed

Centre, Cromwell Street, Oldham OL1 1WR

0161 770 5172

spi@oldham.gov.uk

www.oldham.gov.uk

Guidance Notes

- Please use dark ink.
- Please note that comments cannot be treated as confidential. DATA PROTECTION
- Questions 1 and 2: Please provide your contact details and Agent's, if appropriate.
- Question 3a: Please indicate which SPD document you wish to comment on. If you wish to comment on more than one document, please use a separate form for each one.
- Question 3b: Please indicate whether or not your representation relates to the borough of Oldham only, the borough of Rochdale only, or both Oldham and Rochdale.
- Question 4a: Please indicate whether you are supporting or objecting to the document.
- Question 4b: Please state the reasons for your objection/support.
 - When making comments, it may be useful to consider:
 - CONTENTS
 - Do the documents pick up on the common design problems and opportunities, both in general and specifically to Rochdale and Oldham?
 - Do the documents provide guidance that respects and takes account of the local characteristics of Rochdale and Oldham?
 - APPEARANCE
 - Do the illustrations and captions used in the documents illustrate the issues appropriately?
 - USABILITY
 - Are the documents easy to understand?
 - Is the purpose of the documents and their status clear?
 - Do the documents provide practical guidance?
- Question 4c: Please indicate the change(s) that you wish to see made to the document.
- Question 5: Please include any comments you have about the Sustainability Appraisal
- Question 6: Please include any comments you have about the Habitat Regulations Assessment.
- Question 7: Please include any comments you have about the Equalities Impact Assessment.
- Question 8: Please indicate whether you wish to be notified when the Council has adopted the Urban Design SPD(s)
- Question 9: Please include any comments you have about the Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice document.
- ***Please also complete the equalities monitoring***

Equal Opportunity Monitoring

We want to ensure that what we do reflects the views of a broad range of people from all groups within our community. Please help us to do this by filling in the form below.

Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, a disabled person is someone who has, or has had, a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial or long term adverse effect to his/her ability to carry out normal day to day activities.

Do you consider yourself to have a disability? Yes No

Please Describe.....

My sex is Female Male

My age is

My cultural ethnic origin is:

White

- White British
- White Irish
- Other (Please describe)

- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu
- Muslim
- Sikh
- Other
- No religion
- Prefer not to say

Asian or British Asian

- Bangladeshi
- Indian
- Kashmiri
- Pakistan
- Other (Please describe)

Black or Black British

- African
- Caribbean
- Other (Please describe)

Mixed Race or Dual Heritage

- White Asian
- White/Black African
- White/Black Caribbean
- Other (Please describe)

Chinese or Other Ethnic Group

- Chinese
- Other (Please describe)

My My religion or belief is:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

| |
|---|
| <i>For Official Use Only:</i> Reference: Date Received: Duly made Yes/No |
|---|

| |
|--|
| REPRESENTATION FORM FOR OBJECTING TO OR SUPPORTING THE DRAFT URBAN DESIGN GUIDE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT(S) AND THEIR SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS |
|--|

| 1) Personal Details | | 2) Agent's Details, if appropriate |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Title | | |
| First Name | | |
| Surname | | |
| Organisation | | |
| Address | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Postcode | | |
| Telephone | | |
| Email | | |

**3a) Which document do you wish to comment on?
 (Tick one box only. Please use a separate form for each document you comment on)**

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Urban Design Guide | <input type="checkbox"/> | Residential Design Guide | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Realm Design Guide | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|

3b) Does your comment relate to:

Oldham Borough

 Rochdale Borough

 Oldham and Rochdale

4a) Are you objecting to or supporting the document?

Objecting

 Supporting

4b) Please state clearly and fully the reasons why you are objecting to or supporting the document. Please include the section/paragraph number to which your comment relates.

4c) Please state clearly the changes that you would like to see made to the document. (Use a continuation sheet if necessary)

5) Do you have any comments about the Sustainability Appraisal of the document? (Use a continuation sheet if necessary)

**6) Do you have any comments about the Habitat Regulations Assessment of the document?
(Use a continuation sheet if necessary)**

7) Do you have any comments about the Equalities Impact Assessment of the SPD? (Use a continuation sheet if necessary)

8) Please tick here if you wish to be notified (at the address given in response to Question 1, or Question 2 if you are represented by an Agent) when the final SPD(s) has been adopted

9) Whilst not formally part of the SPD(s) we would also like to use this opportunity to seek your views on the Design and Planning Process: A guide to Good Practice document. Please provide us with any comments you may have below:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Please return the form by 5.00 pm on 16th April 2007 to either:

| | Rochdale MBC | Oldham MBC |
|---|---|---|
| By post to: | Strategic Planning Team, Floor 2, Telegraph House, Baillie Street, Rochdale, OL16 1JH | Strategic Planning and Information, Regeneration Directorate, Oldham MBC, PO Box 452, Oldham Business Centre, Cromwell Street, Oldham OL1 1WR |
| By fax: | 01706 86 4144 | 0161 770 5172 |
| By email: | Strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk | spi@oldham.gov.uk |
| The form can also be downloaded on the Council websites and posted or emailed | www.rochdale.gov.uk | www.oldham.gov.uk |

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS

Appendix 7 - Schedule of Comments received to Draft SPD(s) and the Councils Responses

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | The Theatres Trust | OMBC ref: 526/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 1/DG/001 | Urban design Guide: Supports page 20 5b. However, any restrictive generic signage policies could weaken theatres ability to advertise on the streetscape and impact on economic viability. Specific guidelines for design of signage connected to theatres in the Boroughs should be included to recognise the unique role of these buildings. | The SPD provides guidance relating to the street scene, not in relation to buildings. It is felt that guidelines for the design of signage connected to the theatres is too specific for the SPD. There are policies contained within the UDP's of Oldham and Rochdale that adequately deal with advertisements, generally and within the context of conservation areas and listed buildings, and that appropriate consideration should be given to their impact on visual amenity, residential amenity, and the appearance of the street scene or landscape. | No change required. |
| 2 | Home Builders Federation | OMBC ref: 122/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/001 | (1). Residential Design Guide / Section 5 / pg 38: Supports flexible approach to density based on a number of criteria involving character assessment and accessibility to services, that this document proposes. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | 122/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/002 | (2). Residential Design Guide / Section 5 / pg 38: Objects to guidance on "lifetime homes". Option should require provision of flexibility, without detailing the need for "lifetime homes." | The reference to 'Lifetime Homes' is used as an example of where practical advice can be sought on how to design flexible buildings. | Amend pg38 of the Residential Design Guide to read: 'Lifetime Homes' gives practical advice on how to design flexible buildings, and developers will be <u>expected to consider adaptability and demonstrate how it has been considered within the Design and Access Statement.</u> Measures to promote adaptability <u>may</u> include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>incorporating adequate circulation space for wheelchairs within dwellings;</u> • <u>ensuring that car parking is capable of being enlarged and is an appropriate distance from the dwelling;</u> • incorporating information and communication technology into dwellings; and • designing dwellings so that a home office can be easily provided." |
| | | 122/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/003 | (3). Residential Design Guide / pg 40: Page 40: Objects to all new dwellings meeting the Eco Homes "Very Good" standard as a minimum. HBF notes that the Council requires standards to be set by the new code for Sustainable Homes, which is replacing the Eco Homes standards. | The reference to as a "minimum" should be deleted. Paragraph should be amended to refer to Code for Sustainable Homes. | Amend pg 40 - delete 'as a <i>minimum</i> '. Replace reference to Eco Homes with " <u>Code for Sustainable homes</u> ". |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | 122/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/004 | (4) Design and Planning Process / Section 5: Objects to the expectation for major developments and other developments of community significance to undertake pre- submission community involvement. A more flexible approach to the type of consultation used should be adopted. | Consultation as early as possible with the design and planning process is very important. Encouraging developers to undertake pre-submission community involvement also accords with OMBC's and RMBC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Oldham Council's SCI states " <i>Where the Council considers a proposal to be of a scale and/or nature that is likely to generate significant levels of public interest, the prospective developer will be encouraged to engage the local community and undertake wide consultation. The developer will be expected to submit a statement outlining the extent of the consultation completed with the planning application, and explain how the feedback from the consultation process has influenced the submitted scheme</i> ". Rochdale Council's SCI states " <i>For significant development proposals, the Council would encourage applicants to consult with the local community before submitting their application</i> " | No change required. |
| | | 122/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 2/DG/005 | Design and Planning Process / Section 5: Reference should be made to house builders/ developers/ landowners/ planning and estate agents, when determining who to consult. | Section 5 provides an indication of who may be consulted when designing and planning for development proposals. It is not prescriptive and the process/level of consultation will vary according to the nature of the project. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 3 | Government Office North West | OMBC ref: 045/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 3/DG/001 | (1) General: Support the principles set out in the guidance. The documents helpfully include appendices, which set out the various parent policies to which the individual principles in the SPD relate. It is noted however that there are some gaps where it appears that there are no policy linkages. | Planning Policy Sources to be amended to ensure that all necessary policy linkages are identified. | <p>Amend planning policy sources in the Urban Design Guide to include:</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 5a – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 5c – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 6a – Insert '<u>Physical Regeneration: Policy G/R/1</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 6b – Insert '<u>Design Quality: Policy G/BE/1</u>' and '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 8b – Insert '<u>Design Criteria for New Development: Policy BE/2</u>'.</p> <p>Amend planning policy sources in Public Realm Design Guide to include:</p> <p>Right hand column relating to 'adaptability': Insert '<u>Accessibility: Policy G/A/1</u>'.</p> |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | 045/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 3/DG/002 | (2) General: With regard to design principle 7b the Council (RMBC) may also be able to rely upon the guidance in the PPS on Planning and Climate Change once the final version is published assuming that it continues to take the line that LPA's should require a standard of 10% renewable energy provision. | Planning Policy Sources to be amended to ensure that all necessary policy linkages are identified. | Amend planning policy sources in the Urban Design Guide to include: (2) Right hand column relating to 7b – Insert (in italics) the following: " <i>Rochdale Council will have regard to the draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning and Climate Change Supplement to PPS1. Rochdale Council will produce a Supplementary Planning Document: Energy and New Development in 2008 and after its adoption will expect developments to incorporate measures in accordance with its requirements</i> ". |
| 4 | Natural England | OMBC ref: 002/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/001 | (1) General: Welcome references to local character, topography, landscape and other features; the desire to retain existing natural and landscape features and to safeguard areas of ecological and landscape value; and the section on Design and Access Statements. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | 002/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/002 | (2) General: Would welcome reference to the submission of protected species surveys with applications for development where appropriate. | There are a variety of surveys/documents that may need to be submitted as part of a planning application. The SPD(s) just provides an example of what may need to be submitted. Applicants are advised to contact Development Control as the exact requirement will depend upon the particular circumstances of the site and type of development proposed. | Add sentence to pg 25 of Design and Planning Process Guide to read: " <u>Applicants may also be required to submit other documents with their applications, such as flood risk assessments and contaminated land surveys, depending on the circumstances. Planning authorities can advise on what is likely to be required.</u> " |
| | | 002/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ewf: 4/DG/003 | (3) Public Realm Guide: Support sections concerning sustainability, green spaces and biodiversity in the Public Realm document but would appreciate reference to protected species too. | Reference should be made in pg 25 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the protection of habitats as well as the creation of new. The Oldham UDP and Rochdale UDP also include detailed policies to deal with protected species. | Amend 3 rd bullet point on pg 25 of Public Realm Design Guide to refer to " <u>protecting existing and creating new habitats for wildlife</u> ". |
| | | 002/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 4/DG/004 | (4) Habitat Regulations Assessment: Satisfied with the Habitat Regulations Assessment. | Noted. | No change required. |
| 5 | North West Regional Assembly | OMBC ref: 001/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/001 | (1) General: RPG13 forms an integral part of the development plan and should be given due consideration in the production of the SPD and accompanying SA. Due consideration should also be given to draft RSS. | Noted. The SPD provides further guidance on the implementation of policies within the UDP, which are in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West. Due consideration has also been given to the draft RSS during the preparation of the SPD. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | 001/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/002 | (2) General: May find the North West Best Practice Design Guide a useful document as it provides guidance on areas that the SPD may consider such as Design and Security, EcoHomes, Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, Sustainable Drainage and Modern Methods of Construction. | Reference to be made to the North West Best Practice Guidance where appropriate within the SPD and the appendices. | Include references to "North West Best Practice Design Guide" as follows: - pg 54 of the Urban Design Guide - pg 52 of the Public Realm Design Guide - bottom left hand corner of pg 10 of the Residential Design Guide - pg 48/49 of the Residential Design Guide. |
| | | 001/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 5/DG/003 | (3) General: The SPD may also consider including more detailed guidance on subjects such as incorporation of bin and recycling facilities and cycle storage. | Additional references should be made emphasising the importance of designing-in quality bin and recycling facilities and cycle storage as part of all development where appropriate. | Amend the Urban Design Guide as follows: - Pg 16/4c//6 th bullet point – "secure <u>and convenient</u> cycle parking". Amend Pg 39 of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Reword the first bullet point to read "bin and <u>recycling</u> facilities". Add headline – " <u>Bicycle storage: It is important to ensure that storage facilities are secure and also conveniently located for the use of residents.</u> " |
| 6 | National Trust | OMBC ref: 116/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/001 | (1) General: SPD welcomed. Advice that helps the understanding of design issues and how to address them is encouraged. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | 116/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/002 | <p>(2) General: Not convinced about value of individual documents as there is duplication between them. For example, in respect of sustainable construction and the approach to reducing energy needs/renewables, is a separate section 9 necessary, or would it make sense to amalgamate it with section 7? Equally this is then touched upon briefly in the Residential Design Guide but without cross-reference to the Urban Design Guide; there are some matters such as orientation that are especially relevant.</p> <p>Overall it is considered that some rationalisation of text between the documents together with more cross-referencing would be helpful.</p> | The documents have been prepared so that they can be read in their entirety. It is agreed that more cross-references should be added where appropriate to enable the reader to navigate more easily within and between the documents. Those elements within section 9 that relate to sustainable buildings should be relocated to section 7 and section 9 renamed. | <p>Amend Urban Design Guide as follows:</p> <p>Remove 9a and 9b from Chapter 9 and insert into Chapter 7. Amend title of Chapter 9 (and related principle) accordingly – “Well-designed buildings”</p> <p>Amend pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide under “Providing Energy in Sustainable Ways” to read “<u>Where feasible and appropriate 10% of the total predicated energy requirements of new developments should be provided on-site from renewable resources. These measures should not have an adverse impact on amenity and townscape character and could include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solar panels for pre-heating water; - photovoltaics; - wind; - micro CHP (combined heat and power).” |
| | | 116/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/003 | <p>(3) General: Planning policy sources/glossary and references are duplicated. Once is sufficient.</p> | The documents have been prepared so that they can be read in their entirety. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------|
| | | 116/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/004 | (4) General: Planning policy sources should acknowledge role of RSS as part of the Development Plan. | Pg14 of the Design and Planning Process document acknowledges the role of regional planning guidance and states that developments is expected to conform with regional planning policy. | No change required. |
| | | 116/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/005 | (5) General: Reference should be made in the planning policy sources section to Oldham MBC UDP policy C1.13, which relates to Historic Parks and Gardens, and Rochdale MBC's equivalent policy. | Oldham MBC UDP policy C1.13 relates to the protection of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. The policy identifies three such parks and states that planning permission will not be granted for development, which would lead to the loss of, or cause harm to, the historic character or setting of any part of a designated historic park or garden. The policy specifically relates to development affecting historic parks and gardens and it is not considered to be necessary to cross-refer to it within the SPD. Policy BE/19 of Rochdale's UDP states that development proposals which would result in the loss of, or cause harm to the historic character, structure or setting of any part of a designated historic park or garden will not be permitted. | No change required. |
| | | 116/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/006 | (6) General: It would be sensible to note the role of PPS's/PPG's. | This has been done on page 15 of the Design and Planning Process Guide. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | 116/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/007 | (7) Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a/4th bullet point: Wider landscape context will be an important consideration, particularly for developments on the fringe of an urban area. Reference should be made to the role of Landscape Character Assessment, in accordance with advice in PPS7. | The fourth bullet point reads: "All new development should relate positively to the topography, landscape and other features (such as canals) of the wider area, and respond positively to views towards the site." As part of the preparation work for the Local Development Framework, the Oldham MBC will be reviewing its evidence base insofar as it relates to landscape character assessment. | No change required. |
| | | 116/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/008 | (8) Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a/5th bullet point: Only partially considers designated features of the historic environment. The wider setting of Registered Parks and Gardens will also be an important consideration. | 1a to be amended to refer to heritage buildings and spaces to take into account the wider setting of Registered Parks and Gardens as well as other spaces of historic significance. | Amend Fifth bullet point of 1a on pg 3: add " <u>and spaces</u> " after "heritage buildings". |
| | | 116/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/009 | (9) Urban Design Guide / pg 19 / 5a: The two line drawing (or their captions) have been transposed. | Drawings on page 19 to be amended as captions do not relate to the correct drawing. | Amend pg 19: transpose line drawings. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| | | 116/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/010 | (10) Urban Design Guide / pg 27 / 7a: Section is particularly useful and supported however in addressing causes of climate change the most important consideration is to reduce energy use. Last bullet point should be moved to beginning. | Final bullet point to be moved to second place within the list. | Amend pg 27 / 7a: move final bullet point to second place in list. |
| | | 116/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/011 | (11) Urban Design Guide / pg 31 / 8a: Headline statement is agreed, however, the bullet points should be supplemented to make reference to the need to consider heritage features and the benefits these bring in providing a locally distinctive context to lead new development. | References to the need to consider heritage features and their role in providing a locally distinctive context are made elsewhere in the SPD(s) (e.g. 1a and 1b). As such it is not felt to be appropriate to specifically refer to heritage features in 8a. | No change required. |
| | | 116/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/012 | (12) Urban Design Guide / pg 39: Headline bullet points lack reference to context or the wider setting within which a site sits. | Throughout the SPD the importance of responding to local character and context is emphasised, indeed within section 9 (pg 39) reference is made to the need to ensure new development responds positively to it's context and that careful consideration should be given to, amongst others, character. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | | 116/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/013 | (13) Residential Design Guide / pg 8: There is some duplication between this section and 1a of the Urban Design Guide. If it is to be retained it should consider the wider landscape character context of a site. Particular consideration should be given to heritage and potential impacts upon the settings of designated features. | The Residential Design Guide builds upon the principles set out within the Urban Design Guide. It is agreed that consideration should be given to the wider landscape character context of the site, however, it is considered that such references would be best placed in pg4 and 6 of the Residential Design Guide as they relate to understanding the wider context. | Amend documents as follow: Pg4 – under Character of the Context add bullet point " <u>wider landscape character</u> ". Pg6 – Add heading " <u>Wider landscape context</u> ", under which add the following: " <u>Consideration should be given as to how the development sits in the wider landscape context of the area, so that it respects this character and does not look out of place.</u> " |
| | | 116/UDG/014/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/014 | (14) Residential Design Guide / pg 23: Advice here is important and endorsed, however, reference to the layout of streets and buildings in order to maximise passive solar gain should be incorporated. | Pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide is concerned with the way in which buildings and spaces work together to create townscape. Reference to the layout of streets and buildings in order to maximise passive solar gain is not felt to be appropriate here. Pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide acknowledges the use of passive solar gain to reduce the demand for energy. | See amendment above relating to pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide (116/UDG/002/SPD). |
| | | 116/UDG/015/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/015 | (15). Residential Design Guide / pg 31: Landscape should also be considered with regards to landform and quality of views. The main heading on pg 30 should be amended to read "Green Spaces, and Landscape and Biodiversity" and the section heading amended to read "Landscape and Biodiversity". | Pages 30 and 31 of the Residential Design Guide relate to the creation of new green spaces and the positive opportunity to maintain and enhance the ecological value and biodiversity, which will form part of the wider landscape. It is not considered necessary to add "landscape" to the title as requested. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 116/UDG/016/SPD RMBC ref: 6/DG/016 | (16) Residential Design Guide / pg 40: The wording is considered preferable to that on pg 27 of the Urban Design Guide. | The Urban Design Guide sets out the key principles of good design, whilst the Residential Design Guide provides more information on how these principles may be delivered. It is proposed to reorder the bullet points on pg27 of the Residential Design and Guide and also amend the wording on Pg 40 to better reflect the wording of the Urban Design Guide (see 116/UDG/002/SPD). | No change required. |
| 7 | Yorkshire Forward | OMBC ref: 043/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 7/DG/001 | No comments. | Noted | No change required. |
| 8 | Lancashire County Council | OMBC ref: 698/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 8/DG/001 | No comments. | Noted | No change required. |
| 9 | Failsworth Historical Society | OMBC ref; 665/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/001 | (1). Urban Design Guide: Supports the layout and presentation. A Glossary of terminology used would be helpful. | A glossary has been provided at the end of each document. This will be reviewed and updated to ensure that explanation is provided of appropriate terminology where appropriate. | Glossary to be reviewed and updated as necessary to ensure that explanation provided of terminology where necessary. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | 665/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/002 | (2). Urban Design Guide: Many of the examples of layout, design etc have been introduced into Oldham Town Centre, it is believed that District Centre/township planning development should pay attention to some of these ideas, along with localised consultation with the public and businesses in the area. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 665/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 9/DG/003 | (3). Urban Design Guide: More plain English explanations and less planning jargon would be helpful. | Planning jargon has been kept to a minimum within the document and key terms and phrases have been explained as appropriate within the glossary appended to each document. | No change required. |
| | | 665/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 9/DG/004 | (4). Design and Planning Process: Supports document, gives a reasonable insight, although in brief, to the differing aspects ensuring a good approach to an end product. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | OMBC ref; 665/UDG/005/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/005 | <p>Sustainability Appraisal: Request a more clearly defined statement of intent, outcome and reference to Table 2 Baseline Data in relation to the historic environment.</p> <p>Comparisons, targets, trends and issues leave everything to be debated.</p> | <p>Table 2 "Baseline Data" provides factual information regarding the current position, to assist in the identification of issues and indicators for future monitoring.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above it is acknowledged that the issue identified for the historic environment could be made clearer. It is therefore proposed to amend the "Issue" column in Table 2 on pg 58 the Sustainability Appraisal to read "To conserve the Borough's historical assets". Pg 74 will also need to be amended to reflect this change.</p> | <p>Amend Table 2 on Pg 58 of the Sustainability Appraisal as follows: Delete "The SPD should ensure that the issues around this finite resource remain stable" and replace with "<u>To conserve the Borough's historical assets.</u>"</p> <p>Amend Pg 74 of the Sustainability Appraisal as follows: Add "<u>To conserve the Borough's historical assets</u>" as a bullet point under the Environmental sub-heading of the Key Issues and Problems section.</p> |
| | | 665/UDG/006/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/006 | <p>Sustainability Appraisal: Much else seems to follow planning, regeneration and redevelopment patterns satisfactorily.</p> | Noted | No change required. |
| | | 665/UDG/007/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/007 | <p>Sustainability Appraisal: Indicators relating to the historic environment are considered to be of importance.</p> | Noted | No change required. |
| | | 665/UDG/006/SA RMBC ref: 9/DG/008 | <p>Sustainability Appraisal: Appendix 3 page 83, testing the plan objectives against the sustainability objectives-comments are meaningless as they refer to nothing as a contribution.</p> | The purpose of Appendix 3 to the Sustainability Appraisal is to ensure that there are no conflicts between the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and Plan Objectives and that they are consistent with one another. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| | | OMBC ref; 665/UDG/007/HRA RMBC ref: 9/DG/009 | Habitat Regulation Assessment: Importance should be given to develop dialogue between the waterways authority and OMBC to maximise regeneration along towpaths and canals. | Noted. The HRA was undertaken on behalf of the Councils by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. | No change required. |
| | | OMBC ref; 665/UDG/008/EqIA RMBC ref: 9/DG/010 | Equality Impact Assessment: Other than the reference in Sustainability Objective A the assessment seems satisfactory. | The sustainability objectives listed in Appendix A are those identified within the Sustainability Appraisal. | No change required. |
| 10 | Royton Local History Society | OMBC ref: 666/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/001 | Urban Design Guide / pg viii: Enhancing identity and sense of place is important in a historic context. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 666/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/002 | Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1a: Supports recognition that mills are an important part of the character. Supports acknowledgement that context is important in terms of historic qualities of an area. | Noted | No change required. |
| | | 666/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 10/DG/003 | Urban Design Guide / pg 3 / 1b: Supports recognition of sense of place by retaining historic features. | Noted | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------|
| | | 666/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 10/DG/004 | Design and Planning Process: key messages expressed well but vital that used as intended rather than to justify poor design and planning. E.g. references to "start by developing a good understanding of the site and its context". This should include historic factors and not be a tool for dismissing them as unimportant. More than listed buildings and conservation areas form character. | The Design and Planning Process document sets out good practice and should be read in conjunction with the documents that form the SPD. The need to take into account local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD documents. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | OMBC ref: 666/UDG/005/SA RMBC ref: 10/DG/005 | <p>Sustainability Appraisal: Objective A is very important.</p> <p>Page 53 on character it must be noted in paragraph 3.4 that in Royton money was spent to celebrate increased wealth e.g. Royton baths was built in an Edwardian style, such buildings should be retained.</p> | Noted, paragraph 3.4 is to be reworded to better reflect the distinctive local character of the borough and its heritage. | Delete para 3.4 on pg 53 and replace within the following: <u>"During the second half of the Industrial Revolution Oldham and its surrounding villages grew into the most productive cotton spinning mill area in the world, with the fabric of the town illustrating the social and economic development of the Borough during this period. The multi-storey mills each with their own mill lodges (reservoirs), the forest of mill chimneys, and the associated red brick houses, giving Oldham a special character. There are also many other buildings and areas of historical heritage, whether they be listed buildings, conservations areas, or of local historical significance, which add to the distinctive local character of the borough."</u> |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 11 | Greenfield and Grasscroft Residents Association | OMBC ref: 644/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/001 | Urban Design Guide: It would be wrong to apply the same Urban Design Guide to the many picturesque mill villages in Oldham Borough. Should incorporate a complimentary 'Rural Design Guide' to address specific planning and development issues. | Urban design is as much about the way buildings and environments function as with their appearance. It is about ensuring that development reflects and responds to local character and distinctive, as emphasised throughout the SPD. It is felt that principles set out within the SPD can be applied equally to urban and rural situations, and to built and natural elements. Building on the adoption of the Urban Design Guide the Council may produce additional design-related guidance from time to time as is considered appropriate and necessary. Any additional guidance produced would accord with the general principles set out within the Urban Design Guide, but may look to provide further guidance on specific issues, such as house extensions and canal side development, or may relate to particular areas such as the Saddleworth villages. | No change required. |
| | | 644/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/002 | Urban Design Guide: Supports the usability and layout. An index of topics would be helpful at the back of the document. | Consideration has been given to the inclusion of an index of topics to the SPD however it is considered to be impracticable. The contents pages to the SPD will be made as detailed and clear as possible. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 644/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/003 | Urban Design Guide: Section 6 on 'Adaptability' Requests to add comment regarding the provision of additional parking spaces for residents and visitors when converting houses into flats to reduce on-road parking and accidents. | Car Parking standards are set out within the UDP's for both Oldham and Rochdale. Car parking would therefore be sought as part of any planning application in accordance with these standards and the relevant policy. It is not the role of the Urban Design Guide SPD to seek the provision of additional parking spaces as requested. | No change required. |
| | | 644/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/004 | Urban Design Guide: Section 7 on 'Sustainability' request comment regarding the need for sufficient refuse storage areas, which is mentioned in the Residential Design section. | It is considered that the Urban Design Guide adequately addresses the need for appropriate refuse storage. 7d states that development proposals must appropriate provision for the sustainable management and discharge of waste and that where possible they should: - incorporate facilities for segregation, storage and collection of recyclable waste such as paper, glass, metal and bio-degradable material; and - ensure that facilities such as recycling bins, refuse storage and collection areas and composters are integrated into the design of areas and buildings in a non-intrusive and attractive manner. Notwithstanding the above greater emphasis is to be made to the need for recycling and cycle storage within the Residential Design Guide on pg 39. | Amend the Urban Design Guide as follows: - Pg 16/4c//6 th bullet point – "secure <u>and convenient</u> cycle parking". Amend Pg 39 of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Reword the first bullet point to read "bin and <u>recycling</u> facilities". Add headline – " <u>Bicycle storage: It is important to ensure that storage facilities are secure and also conveniently located for the use of residents.</u> " |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|
| | | 644/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/005 | Public Realm Design Guide: Pleased that sections 4 & 5 address traffic management issues. | Noted | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | 644/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 11/DG/006 | Public Realm Design Guide: At the end of section 5 on public consultation, it is unclear when public consultation is mandatory or when work can be carried out without consultation. | Engagement with the local community is not mandatory however it is encouraged. Consultation as early as possible with the design and planning process is very important. Encouraging developers to undertake pre-submission community involvement also accords with OMBC's and RMBC's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Oldham Council's SCI states " <i>Where the Council considers a proposal to be of a scale and/or nature that is likely to generate significant levels of public interest, the prospective developer will be encouraged to engage the local community and undertake wide consultation. The developer will be expected to submit a statement outlining the extent of the consultation completed with the planning application, and explain how the feedback from the consultation process has influenced the submitted scheme</i> ". Rochdale Council's SCI states " <i>For significant development proposals, the Council would encourage applicants to consult with the local community before submitting their application</i> " | No change required. |
| 12 | British Waterways | OMBC ref: 073/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 12/DG/001 | Urban Design Guide / pg 4 / 1b: Should include reference to "canals". New developments should | It is agreed that new developments should ensure that access through to public natural and landscape features are enhanced or provided where | Add an additional bullet point to 1b of the Urban Design Guide to read: "Where the development site is |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | ensure that access through to public natural and landscape features are enhanced or provided where possible. The impact of development on the visual amenity of waterway users also needs to be considered. | possible, and that the impact of development on the visual amenity of the water should be considered. It is proposed to amend references to canals where appropriate to emphasise the importance of access and visual amenity. | <p><u>adjacent to a canal or other watercourse, the development should enhance the setting of the waterway and present a positive frontage to it, and particular consideration should be given to enhancing the ecological value of the waterway and improving views for it's users.</u></p> <p><u>Developments should take opportunities to improve pedestrian (and, where appropriate, cycle) access to towpaths and footpaths adjoining waterways."</u></p> <p>Amend pg 8 of Residential Design Guide, under "Edge Conditions" to add additional bullet point "<u>Does a waterway run along the edge of the site?"</u></p> |
| 13 | Highways Agency | OMBC ref: 005/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 13/DG/001 | Urban Design Guide: Welcomes the principals, particularly sections 4b & 4c on the ease of movement. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 005/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/002 | Residential Design Guide: Supports the principals, particularly on Integrating Sustainability. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 005/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/003 | Public Realm Design Guide: Welcomes the aim to improve pedestrian experience. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | 005/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/004 | Design and Planning Process: Page 12 – replace questions with “what transport is available? Are improvements required to existing roads, public transport services or facilities to aid pedestrian and cycle movement?” This would be more consistent with the Good Practice Guide and the new guidance on Transport Assessments and PPG13. | Page 12 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended. | Amend wording as requested on page 12 of Design and Planning Process document: <u>“What transport is available? Are improvements required to existing roads, public transport services or facilities to aid pedestrian and cycle movement?”</u> |
| | | 005/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/005 | Design and Planning Process: Page 13 – Reword the transport bullet point to: “What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes close to the site? Is there sufficient public transport capacity? Are improvements to provision of public transport services required? What cycle and pedestrian facilities exist? Are any improvements required?” | Page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended. | Amend wording as requested on page 13 of Design and Planning Process document: <u>“What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes close to the site? Is there sufficient public transport capacity? Are improvements to provision of public transport services required? What cycle and pedestrian facilities exist? Are any improvements required?”</u> |
| | | 005/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/006 | Design and Planning Process: Page 13 – Request to include “What level of car parking should be provided?” in the Traffic bullet point rather than the transport bullet point. | Page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document to be amended . | Move “ <i>What level of car parking should be provided?</i> ” to the traffic bullet point on page 13 of the Design and Planning Process document. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | 005/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 13/DG/007 | Design and Planning Process: Page 22 – Should include advice to encourage developers to consult with the Agency at the earliest possible stage where their development is likely to have an impact on a motorway or trunk road. | Page 22 provides some examples of the type of organisations it may be appropriate to consult with for specialist advice. It would be inappropriate to add more examples at the risk this could be taken as a complete list. | No change required. |
| 14 | Taylor Young | 699/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/001 | General: Commends the layout and presentation of the documents and the glossary. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 699/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/002 | General: An index would be helpful on the issues/ sections. | Consideration has been given to the inclusion of an index of topics to the SPD however it is considered to be impracticable. The contents pages to the SPD will be made as detailed and clear as possible. | No change required. |
| | | 699/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/003 | General: Appearance of the front covers and overall graphic design could be strengthened and the same page layout (either landscape or portrait) be used for all four documents. | The different page layouts were intentional at consultation stage, to see if people had any particular preference. On reflection all documents are to be made portrait, as it is considered the documents will be easier to view electronically. The front covers are also to be made consistent with one another. | All documents are to be made portrait. Front covers are to be made consistent with one another. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 699/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/004 | General: The principals contain six out of seven of the design objectives from 'By Design' (CABE, 2000) as well as four principles, which reflect contemporary government policy. Using the same chapter headings as the above guidance makes the document easier to read. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 699/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/005 | <p>General: Guidance on character could be improved by referring to local context e.g. outlining the materials used in the Boroughs.</p> <p>The Design Guide is an opportunity to promote local distinctiveness and should emphasise the ways in which Oldham and Rochdale should differ from elsewhere. Guidance could express how the urban form and vernacular of the Pennine towns differ from that of Oldham and Rochdale towns; spatial context plans and photographs could be used to support this. This could be provided in a separate document as a study of local character and referred to in the character section of the Urban Design Guide.</p> | <p>The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to produce a separate document providing a study of local character.</p> | Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| | | 699/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/006 | General: Concerns following the publication of 'Manual for Streets' that considering residential design separately from street design may perpetrate poor practice. | It is not the intention that residential design be considered separately from street design. The SPD provides guidance on how to create places and provides the relevant cross-references where necessary. | No change required. |
| | | 699/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/007 | General: There are duplications between the three documents. The additional design guides should only contain information too specific for the main design guide. | The Residential Design Guide and Public Realm guide build on the principles set out within the Urban Design Guide. The documents have been prepared so that they can be read individually. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | 699/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/008 | Design and Planning Process: Supports the handbook. Could be improved by tying it better with the design guidance, referring to the ten principals and including 'refer to design guidance on these principals' where appropriate. | The introduction to the Design and Planning Process document shall be amended to cross-refer to the SPD documents as appropriate. | Amend second paragraph on the inside cover of the Design and Planning Process Guide to be replaced with the following: <u>"This Design and Planning Process: A Guide to Good Practice aims to assist all those involved in the process of designing and constructing buildings, streets and spaces to create good quality places, and compliments the series of design guides which have been produced jointly by Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council, Rochdale Metropolitan Borough, and the Oldham Rochdale Partners in Action Housing Market Renewal. These guides, which are informed by planning policies in the two Borough's Unitary Development Plans (UDPs), include an overall Design Guide that provides guidance for all forms of development throughout the two Boroughs."</u> |
| | | 699/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/009 | Urban Design Guide / Chapter 5: could define 'legible environment' and link legibility to townscape and landscape. | An explanation of "legibility" is provided on pg 18 of the Urban Design Guide. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | 699/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/010 | Urban Design Guide / Chapter 5 / Pg 19: The graphic on legibility suggests that development should be large and positioned to interfere with views towards landmarks. Such small images and images in the character section illustrating character types need to be explored. | Transpose line drawings. | Transpose line drawings. |
| | | 699/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 14/DG/011 | Urban Design Guide / Chapter 3: In the diversity chapter, guidance on open space does not relate much to diversity and would be better located in the 'good streets and spaces' chapter. The chapters on diversity and adaptability could be consecutive as the two concepts are closely related. | The guidance provided on open space within the "Diversity" section relates to the need for development to support variety, choice and accessibility in the public realm for all members of the local community, recognising the role that open space has in encouraging interaction. | No change required. |
| | | 699/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/012 | Urban Design Guide / Pg 38: Replace reference to 'Ecohomes' with the new 'Code for Sustainable Homes' and determine an appropriate score. | Reference to "Ecohomes" to be replaced by "Code for Sustainable Homes". | Reference to "Ecohomes" Very Good to be replaced by "Code for Sustainable Homes" Level 3. |
| | | 699/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref; 14/DG/013 | Urban Design Guide / Pg vi: Add design review and pre-application discussion to the box on 'processes supporting good urban design'. | Design review and pre-application discussion would form part of the "design solutions" and "applications and approvals". It is not considered necessary to add any additional processes. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------|
| 15 | Environment Agency | OMBC ref: 003/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/001 | Supports the documents and finds them clear in what they are aiming to achieve. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 003/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref; 15/DG/002 | Developments that are at risk of flooding or will increase the risk of flooding will have to undertake a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in accordance with PPS25 Annex E. The Design and Planning Process does not mention a FRA. There is now a requirement for any development over 1ha to contain a FRA. | The issue of flood risk would be considered as part of a planning application and is reflected within both borough's UDPs. Page 27 provides examples of the types of assessments that may be submitted and states that "developers should discuss drawings and documents they proposes submitting with planning officers before making a planning application." | No change required. |
| | | 003/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 15/DG/003 | Urban Design Guide / Chapter 7: 7c refers to designing development to incorporate flood prevention. Would like to see reference to locating development away from areas of flood risk in addition to reducing surface water run off. The risk based sequential test should be applied. It is essential that this is taken into account when considering the design of new development. | Flood risk will be considered as part of the planning application process, where the principle of development on a site would be considered taking account and balancing the various constraints. The SPD provides guidance on how development can incorporate measures for flood prevention through design. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 003/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/004 | The importance of watercourses should be recognised for the valuable ecological habitats they provide. The guides refer to enhancement of biodiversity. Reference should be made to retaining and integrating watercourse where feasible. | Reference to be made to retaining and integrating watercourses will be added as appropriate. | Amend 7e on pg28 of the Urban Design Guide to read: "sensitively integrate existing open space and landscape features (<u>including watercourses</u>) into the proposed development, <u>including the opening up of culverted watercourses where feasible.</u> " |
| | | 003/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/005 | General: Where development encroaches a main river 8m should be left clear and unobstructed. Within this margin land drainage consent will be required from the EA. | Consultation would take place with the Environment Agency with regards to the appropriate planning applications. It is not considered necessary to make reference to such detailed requirements within the SPD. | No change required. |
| | | 003/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 15/DG/006 | General: Pleased to see sustainability topics such as waste, renewable energy, water resources and SUDs included. | Noted. | No change required. |
| 16 | GMPTE | 119/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/001 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 9: Include potential public transport links in addition to vehicle access and possibilities for cyclists and pedestrians to improve access. | Pg 9 of the Design and Planning Process is looking at analysis of the site. The need to consider public transport links is appropriately recognised elsewhere in the document when looking at the wider context (i.e. pg 13). | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| | | 119/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/002 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 10: In the list of local destinations public transport should be included as a desired destination. Public transport facilities could be improved through developer contribution in addition to community facilities | Reference to bus stops to be added to pg 10 of the Design and Planning Process document. | Amend first bullet point on pg 10 to include " <u>bus stops</u> " as a destination. |
| | | 119/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/003 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 13: Welcomes transport being considered as a key technical issue. Would like to see frequency of services, the location of bus stops, railway stations and Metrolink stops, and the possibility of public transport improvements also considered. | Reference to be made to frequency of services, railway station and Metrolink stops to be added as suggested. | Amend "Transport" to read: " <u>What forms of transport will people use? Are there bus routes/stops, railway stations or Metrolink stops close to the site? How frequent are public transport services in the area?</u> " |
| | | 119/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/004 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 15: GMPTE have produced 'Land Use Planning & Public Transport' guidance. This could be considered as an important local policy document to improve the urban design of new development. | There are a number of documents of this sort of relevance and it would be inappropriate in this context to try and list them all. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------|
| | | 119/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/005 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 22/23: GMPTE should be consulted early on planning applications, preferably at pre-application stage. Request to be mentioned as an important consultee, and listed under the section 'With other agencies and bodies'. | Page 22 of the Design and Planning Process provides some examples of the type of organisations it may be appropriate to consult with for specialist advice. It would be inappropriate to add more examples at the risk this could be taken as a complete list. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/006 | Design and Planning Process / Pg 27: As part of outline or full planning applications an interim of final travel plan should be submitted, either forming part of the Transport Assessment or being submitted separately. The Travel Plan should be listed within the above section alongside other required information or within the Transport Assessment paragraph. Travel plans can have a number of benefits to new development, contributing to the access and sustainability issues of urban design. | Page 27 provides examples of the types of assessments that may be submitted and states that "developers should discuss drawings and documents they proposes submitting with planning officers before making a planning application." | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 119/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/007 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 3: List of principals should include 'Accessibility'. 'Ease of Movement' covers some accessibility issues but a new section could place more emphasis on accessibility to essential local services and employment areas by sustainable transport. | It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/008 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 9: Important to emphasise the benefits of incorporating sustainable modes of transport into the design of a development in addition to ensuring a sustainable development and a sustainable community. | Page 9 is not considered to be an appropriate place to address transport matters. This matter is addressed in the Urban Design Guide. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/009 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 12: Important that measures to restrict vehicle speeds does not have negative impacts on buses and other sustainable modes of transport. | Pg 12 of the Public Realm Design Guide shall be amended to highlight the need to ensure that measures to restrict vehicle speed do not have negative impacts on buses and other sustainable transport modes as suggested. | Amend first paragraph, second sentence as follows: " <u>Streets should be designed to keep speeds to 20mph or less by making exceeding these speeds different for the driver, whilst maintaining access for public transport and emergency vehicles.</u> " |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 119/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/010 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 26: Arterial roads have the potential to serve as bus prioritised routes. The inclusion of high quality public transport waiting facilities can add character and provide security for public transport users. | Amend the second bullet point on page 27 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the provision of quality public transport waiting facilities. | Second bullet point to be amended to read "they need to become places that are more welcoming for pedestrians, for example, by providing defined, safe crossing points at locations convenient for those on foot <u>and by providing quality public transport waiting facilities.</u> " |
| | | 119/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/011 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 27: Traffic calming measures along local distributor roads should not impact negatively on public transport. Busy routes have potential for bus priority measures with the provision of waiting facilities that enhance security and aesthetics. | Pg 27 recognises the differing design issues for arterial roads whilst maintaining their role as major traffic routes. | See above. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | 119/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/012 | Public Realm Design Guide / Pg 34: Welcomes that street scene investment should be planned alongside highway investment, as required when designing gateways and corridors particularly in town centres and along Quality Bus Corridors. Therefore recommendations for pages 26 & 27 should be taken into account. Would welcome the suggestion that opportunities should be taken to develop new interchanges, including Metrolink stops. | See responses above to representations received regarding pg 26 and pg 27 of the Public Realm Design Guide. Reference to interchanges is a strategic matter rather than a design principle. | See above. |
| | | 119/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/013 | Residential Design Guide / Pg 3: 'Accessibility' should be included as a principal concept with a new section. | It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/014/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/014 | Residential Design Guide / Pg 8: Access considerations should include the locality of public transport facilities, and existing transport routes through and near a site highlighting any required improvements. | Amend pg8 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the need to take into account the locality of public transport facilities and existing transport routes as suggested. | Amend "Access" on Pg 8 of the Residential Design Guide to include the following: " <u>Where are public transport facilities located in relation to the site? Are there existing public transport routes through or near the site? Are improvements required?</u> " |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | 119/UDG/015/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/015 | Residential Design Guide / Pg 13: Important to consider direct routes through a site, which takes into account public transport and improves accessibility, can reduce the need for the private car. This should be mentioned in the above section and listed as one of the bullet points. | Amend pg13 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the connection of pedestrian routes within the site to areas beyond. | Amend third bullet point on Pg 13 of the Residential Design Guide to read " <u>Pedestrian routes within the site should connect with the places that people want to go to outside of the site area, for example schools, shops, open spaces, places of worship and public transport facilities.</u> " |
| | | 119/UDG/016/SPD RMBC ref; 16/DG/016 | Residential Design Guide / Pg 17: Encouraging that the document promotes connecting to the wider areas through public transport, walking and cycling. | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/017/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/017 | Urban Design Guide / Pg 3: 'Accessibility' should be included as a principal concept within the contents with a new section. | It is considered that accessibility is adequately covered throughout the SPD and that a separate section on "accessibility" is not required. | No change required. |
| | | 119/UDG/018/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/018 | Urban Design Guide / Pg 15/16: Ease of Movement Table 4b & 4c: welcomes the comments in the tables concerning public transport and cycling & walking. | Noted. | No change required. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | 119/UDG/019/SPD RMBC ref: 16/DG/019 | Urban Design Guide / Chapter 7: Like the "Ease of Movement" chapter, this should promote sustainable modes of transport and ensures that it is a consideration within urban design for new developments. | It is considered that the promotion of sustainable modes of transport is adequately covered elsewhere within the SPD (see Ease of Movement section). | No change required. |
| 17 | Littleborough Historical and Archaeological Society | OMBC ref: 700/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 17/DG/001 | General – what happens outside Littleborough is not within the Society's remit. Our views on Littleborough are well covered in the Town Design Statement and accompanying Heritage Statement. | The new Guidance sets out key design principles and emphasises the need for development to have regard to local context and character. The Town Design Statement sets out what this character is, and thus the documents and the Design Statement will work in a complementary manner. | No change required. |
| 18 | Rochdale Development Agency | 701/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 18/DG/001 | (1) Urban Design Guide: Concern that the principles could apply anywhere and not specifically to Oldham and Rochdale. There are too few visual examples. | The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs. | Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale. |
| | | 701/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref:18/DG/002 | (2) Urban Design Guide / pg 44: There are two 10bs. | Last box to re-labelled box '10c'. | Re-label last box'10c'. |
| | | 701/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 18/DG/003 | (3) General: Documents should refer to the Manual for Streets. | Document to be amended to refer to Manual for Streets. | Amend the document to refer to Manual for Streets rather than Design Bulletin 32 as follows: - Pg 15 of the Public Realm Design Guide; and - Pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | 701/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 18/DG/004 | <p>(4) Public Realm Design Guide / pg 38-39: Concerned that this section is at odds with principles developed for the Public Realm Handbook. Particular points raised regarding the furniture zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SPD should offer guidance about how wide the footway needs to be to accommodate such a zone; - Street furniture needs to co-ordinated within wider-geographical areas, rather than on a street by street basis; - Appreciate the need to prioritise corridors however the principle of reducing clutter should be adopted throughout the Borough. | <p>The diagram on pg 39 of the Public Realm Design Guide provides an indication of how wide a footpath would be expected to be to accommodate a 'furniture zone'.</p> <p>The fifth bullet point on pg 38 of the Public Realm Design Guide should be amended to refer to the wider areas as appropriate.</p> <p>Whilst the 'Reducing Clutter' section highlights major corridors it also recognises that the principles can be applied to all streets.</p> | <p>Amend reducing clutter section as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - pg 38/fifth bullet point – add <i>“and wider area as appropriate”</i>; and - pg 39 - 'Furniture zone' to be shown to the rear of the footway. <p>Amend pg 52 of the Public Realm Guide and pg 23 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the RDA's "Public Realm Handbook".</p> |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|---|--|---|---|---|
| 19 | Rochdale Environmental Management | OMBC ref: 702/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 19/DG/001 | Urban Design Guide: Needs positive advice re: canal frontage of developments, it isn't clear how they should be designed. | Agree that more needs to be included in respect of development adjacent to canals and other watercourses. | Add an additional bullet point to 1b of the Urban Design Guide to read: <u>"Where the development site is adjacent to a canal or other watercourse, the development should enhance the setting of the waterway and present a positive frontage to it, and particular consideration should be given to enhancing the ecological value of the waterway and improving views for it's users. Developments should take opportunities to improve pedestrian (and, where appropriate, cycle) access to towpaths and footpaths adjoining waterways."</u> |
| | | OMBC ref: 702/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 19/DG/002 | Public Realm Guide page 9: Include other water features including the canal, rivers in features to be incorporated into sustainable development and contribute to sustainability of place. | Agree that guidance in respect of water features on sites should be expanded. | Amend fourth bullet point on pg 9 of the Public Realm Design Guide to read " <u>incorporate existing water features and also....etc."</u> |
| | | OMBC ref: 702/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref: 19/DG/003 | Public Realm Guide page 25: Could use canal example here. | Agree that photograph of canal should be on this page. | Photograph of canal to be sourced for pg 25 of the Public Realm Guide and first bullet point to be amended to read as follows <u>"retaining existing vegetation and water features where possible."</u> |
| | | OMBC REF: 702/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 19/DG/004 | (4) Public Realm Design Guide page 42: why is this separate from the section on page 31 | Page 31 refers to the problems of green spaces and page 42 how to improve them. However, this should be made clearer | Amend title on pg 42 of the Public Realm Design Guide to read <u>"Improving Green Spaces"</u> . |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 20 | Castleton Residents Association | OMBC ref: 703/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref; 20/DG/001 | The involvement in consulting residents and local people must be a paramount consideration when major changes are proposed. | Agree that guide should emphasise the importance of local consultation. | Amend pg 23 of the Design and Planning Process document to read "developers are encouraged to speak to local people and groups" |
| 21 | CABE | 080/UDG/001/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/001 | (1) General: Documents work well as a suite and provide guidance to achieving good quality urban design across the two borough's | Noted. | No change required. |
| | | 080/UDG/002/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/002 | (2) General: Suggest taking a step back and consider whether our objectives for each of the guides have been fully met. Welcome the preparation of locally specific guidance. Greater clarity regarding audience, purpose and scope will help planning applicants use the guides for their intended purpose. | Greater clarification should be provided regarding audience, purpose and scope of the document as suggested. | Amend documents to provide greater clarification regarding audience, purpose and scope through replacing the final sentence on, pgiii of the Urban Design Guide, pg2 of the Public Realm Design Guide and pg 2 of the Residential Design Guide with the following: <u>"Its aim is to provide clear guidance to everyone in designing and constructing streets and space (including architects, designers, public and private sector developers, house builders and engineers) on the quality of design expected by both Boroughs. The Guide will also be used by local authority officers to help assess the quality of planning applications."</u> |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 080/UDG/003/SPD RMBC ref; 21/DG/003 | (3) General: There is an opportunity for the SPD to add more value, be a more useful practical tool and have wider influence by adding depth to the generic guidance through demonstrating more clearly how an analysis of local context should inform development proposals. | The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs. Reference should be added to pg 15 of Design and Planning Process Guide to refer to the fact that there may be local characterisation studies/masterplans and development briefs of relevance. | Amend pg 15 of the Design and Planning Process Guide to read as follows: "Are there <u>other</u> Supplementary Planning Documents, Area Action Plans, development briefs, <u>masterplans or related documents prepared by the Council</u> that affect the site and/or type of development proposed?" |
| | | 080/UDG/004/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/004 | (4). General: The guides would benefit from signposting generic guidance about good design. | References to be added throughout the documents to generic guidance about good design as appropriate. | Amend reference to Ecohomes on pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide to read: "All new dwellings will be encouraged to meet the <u>standards within the Code for Sustainable Homes</u> (www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506120)". |
| | | 080/UDG/005/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/005 | (5). General: Locally specific context-setting information would be useful at start of the guides. | The need to take account of and reflect local character and distinctiveness is emphasised throughout the SPD. More local images have also been added to the SPD to further reflect the local character of the two boroughs. | Add more local images relating to Oldham and Rochdale. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| | | 080/UDG/006/SPD RMBC ref; 21/DG/006 | (6). General: To add depth and rigour to the section on contextual analysis it may be helpful to refer to some other examples of local authority design guides. | Signposting has been added throughout the documents to generic guidance on good design as suggested. It is not however considered appropriate to refer to other local authority design guides. | No change required. |
| | | 080/UDG/007/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/007 | (7). General: Needs to be clearer how strong the policies on design from the Local Plans might be interpreted in practice and how, therefore, good quality development may be encouraged, recognised, assessed and approved. There is an opportunity to positively specify quality parameters (by for example making reference to established tools and standards such as Building for Life and Code for Sustainable Homes. | References to be added throughout the documents to generic guidance about good design as appropriate. | Amend reference to Ecohomes on pg 40 of the Residential Design Guide to read: <u>"All new dwellings will be encouraged to meet the standards within the Code for Sustainable Homes (www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1506120)".</u> |
| | | 080/UDG/008/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/008 | (8). General: Need to be clearer about what is acceptable, beyond expressing ideal processes and what "should" or "could" be done. | Statements below images will be made clearer to identify which are examples of good and bad practice and a tick/cross system shall be introduced as appropriate throughout the document to identify examples of good and bad practice. | Statements below images will be made clearer to identify which are examples of good and bad practice. Tick/crosses to be introduced in the following image: Pg 15 of the Urban Design Guide – add a cross to the middle image and a tick to the bottom image. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | 080/UDG/009/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/009 | (9) Design and Planning Process: Although the recommended approach to design is clear in the Process Guide, it may be oversimplified in places (for example consultation is an iterative process). | It is agreed that consultation is an iterative process and that showing it at one stage may not be appropriate. The arrows within the strap line should be removed to show design and planning as one continuous process rather than identifying particular stages. | Arrows to be removed from strap line in the guide which identifies what part of the process the guidance relates to. |
| | | 080/UDG/010/SPD RMBC ref; 21/DG/010 | (10) Design and Planning Process: Design and Access Statement section is welcomed however it repeats national guidance without further clarity about local issues, which should be addressed. It may also specify what information should be included within the application and what should go in the Statement, | Local issues may differ depending upon the application site and nature of the development proposed, it is therefore not felt to be appropriate to refer to specific requirements within the SPD. | No change required. |
| | | 080/UDG/011/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/011 | (11) Design and Planning Process: Should set out other sources of design guidance and advice (i.e. pre-application discussions, case studies, advice from regional and/o design review panels). | Agreed. | Page 25 of the Design and Planning Process guide to include paragraph advising that applicants discuss proposed applications with Local Planning Authorities first. |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|----|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | | 080/UDG/012/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/012 | (12) Public Realm Design Guide: Approach to open space needs strengthening. | Reference should be made to the need to link into a wider green space strategy. | Amend pg 24 of the Public Realm Design Guide as follows: "High quality open space brings many benefits to residential environments. Good spaces: - function well for their intended use, which may include play, exercise and/or relaxation; - <u>fit into a wider green space strategy</u> ; - provide an area with a sense of identity and community; - are usually located at the heart of the development, rather than being a left over space on the edge; - <u>make the most of existing landscape features and assets</u> ; and - <u>take into consideration long-term funding and maintenance.</u> |
| | | 080/UDG/013/SPD RMBC ref: 21/DG/013 | (13) General: Documents would benefit from a general review of terminology, that illustrations and captions are appropriate and clear, and to ensure that most recent national guidance is referred to. | Agreed. | Terminology/illustration/caption check of SPD. Need to also make sure that the more recent national guidance is referred to. Review illustration on: Residential Design Guide pg 27; and Public Realm Design Guide pg 44/45. |
| 22 | Middleton Environment Group | OMBC ref: 704/UDG/001/SPD | The documents are hard to understand and meaningless to 'Joe Public'. Suggest a simpler version | The production of a summarised version for consultation would be inappropriate, as all readers should have the opportunity to | Amend pg 52 of the Urban Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). |

| | Individual/ Organisation | Reference Number | Comments Received | RMBC/OMBC's Response | Change / Comments |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| | | RMBC ref; 22/DG/001 | for comment in plain English with less use of acronyms. | view the whole document. | Amend pg 51 of the Public Realm Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Amend pg 47 of the Residential Design Guide to refer to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). |

Changes have also been made to the SPD(s) and supporting documents for editorial and presentational reason, to clarify statements where appropriate and update the documents.